

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 095

IR 050 917

TITLE Remote Storage. SPEC Kit 39.
INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
 Office of Management Studies.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 167p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - General (020) -- Guides -
 Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Descriptive
 (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Costs; Higher Education; Library
 Facilities; *Library Materials; Library Personnel;
 *Library Planning; Library Services; Library Surveys;
 Methods: *Research Libraries; Selection; Storage
IDENTIFIERS *Book Storage; *Library Procedures

ABSTRACT

A 1977 Association of Research Libraries (ARL) survey gathered information and documentation on remote storage for selected library materials, including type and size of facilities, selection processes for transferring materials, operating procedures, and record-changing activities. A summary of the survey results included in this kit reports findings on facilities, characteristics of compact storage collections, selection of materials, public services, and staffing and costs. The kit also contains: (1) general information and descriptions from The Council on Library Resources and University of California at Berkeley; (2) planning documents from Washington University, Princeton University, and Cornell University; (3) general procedures documents from Princeton University, University of Pittsburgh, Washington University, and McMaster University; (4) selection procedures documents from University of California at Davis, Cornell University, and Washington State University; and (5) a retrieval procedures document from Pittsburgh University. The introduction provides a concise summary of issues and trends related to remote storage which covers general advantages and disadvantages, physical facilities, bibliographic records and choice of stored materials, and user access. (THC)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *



December 1977

OMS

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

ED251095

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Remote Storage

Kit 39

IR050917

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the
Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies,
1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.



December 1977, No. 39



Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

REMOTE STORAGE IN ARL LIBRARIES

The library building boom between 1967 and 1974 increased the capacity of many academic and research libraries, but statistics show that collections grew faster than space for them. Today, providing cost-effective yet usable remote and/or compact storage facilities for selected library materials is one of several answers to the space crunch.

In a survey undertaken as part of a Council on Library Resources Fellowship in 1974, 35 libraries reported having book storage facilities, 13 expressed an imminent need for such facilities, and 25 saw no immediate problem. This year, Cornell University's Olin Library surveyed ARL members to gather current information and documentation on remote storage -- type and size of facilities, selection processes for transferring materials, operating procedures, and record-changing activities. Of 97 replies, 45 libraries indicate they regularly select materials from the main stacks and transfer them to remote storage. Of these 45 libraries, 26 indicate they make use of compact storage techniques to increase the number of books shelved per unit of space, i.e., high shelves; narrow aisles; moveable shelving; or shelving of books by size or on their foredge. As more libraries establish remote storage policies, several major issues emerge: general advantages and disadvantages; nature and location of a facility; bibliographic records and choice of stored materials; and user access.

General Advantages and Disadvantages. Remote storage allows for the retention of materials in their original format, which many librarians believe is an advantage compared with the alternatives of microfilming or weeding. The removal of little-used materials to a separate location can also lead to more meaningful and usable central collections. Sometimes, storage away from the center of campus can save money because of less expensive land costs, and maintaining such a facility is usually cheaper than maintaining a central collection.

The major drawback to remote storage is limited user service and access to materials. Browsing usually is impossible, and users often must wait up to a day to receive materials. However, because of the nature of its collection, a typical storage facility circulates only about 5% of its holdings, as compared to normal figures of 40% or more. Most libraries report high start-up costs, since the planning and construction or conversion of facilities is time-consuming, and costly, as are the processes of altering records and selecting materials.

Physical Facility. Libraries responding to the Cornell study used one of five types of facilities for remote storage: 1) modification of a commercial building, 2) utilization of a former library building, 3) location in the sub-basement of the main library, 4) use of an assembly or warehouse building, or 5) construction of a new facility built for remote storage. The main considerations in choosing a facility are retrieval convenience, adaptability to use as a storage facility, environmental suitability, and cost of the land and/or buildings.

Once a facility is selected, other choices involve: the type of shelving and configuration of shelves and aisles which will maximize capacity of the storage area, the type of user services and facilities, the shelving patterns, and staffing. From the Cornell results, it appears that most libraries use low-cost or conventional library shelving although a few have opted for industrial or specially made compact shelving. Devices for automatic retrieval of books have not been judged cost effective for most research library applications.

Bibliographic Records and Choice of Stored Materials. A major dilemma reported by research libraries is maintaining convenient bibliographic access to stored materials, while altering bibliographic records economically. Because of the expense and time involved, many libraries have chosen not to change records substantially when moving materials to remote storage. However, a few respondents did change card catalog records, and others created computerized print-outs. A separate shelf-list for remote storage materials, used in conjunction with records in the circulation file, is noted as being a good system because it minimizes record-changing and allows easy re-entry to main shelves if necessary.

Little-used materials are the prime candidates for remote storage, and nearly all libraries designate blocks of materials to be moved rather than individual items because of the lower cost of selection and record-changing. Criteria for remote storage include dated serial material, material in suspended classification systems, duplicate copies, large gift collections, discontinued serials, and hardcopy of materials on film. Libraries also take into consideration the subject matter and format of material. Library personnel usually make the decisions concerning stored materials, and faculty are often consulted concerning specific areas.

User Access. Many decisions regarding access are made at the time the facility is designed and staffed -- i.e. type of study areas (if any), hours of operation, and type and frequency of paging services. Most policies stress fast retrievability, flexibility, and accommodation to user needs. Some libraries, for instance, routinely return any book requested by a faculty member to the main stacks.

Issues and Trends. Libraries usually develop a remote storage policy and facility in the context of an overall collection policy, which can result in a mix of solutions to overcrowded shelves -- weeding, expanded use of interlibrary loans, and microfilming along with remote storage. In turn, the use data obtained during selection of materials for remote storage can be helpful in refining and updating acquisitions policies.

A main concern throughout planning and implementation is to make the concept of remote storage as attractive as possible to the university administration and to users. If the faculty, trustees, and public are kept informed throughout the decision-making of the context of the need and the advantages of remote storage, the library is more apt to receive support. Attention to 1) reversability and compatibility with the main library and 2) future expansion of the facility is important during planning. Flexibility of policy is seen as crucial. Many libraries keep an accurate account of the use of the storage facility in order to monitor and alter selection policies and to determine which books should be reshelfed in the main library or, in the case of older Dewey materials, which should be reclassified.

Cooperative efforts such as New England Deposit Library, the Center for Research Libraries, and the Hampshire Inter-Library Center, or a shared facility like U.C. Berkeley's Richmond storage building can offer advantages such as reduction of duplicates if institutions can cooperate on acquisitions and collection policies. However, the possible reduced costs of such combined facilities do not seem to be realized currently. Although a national or regional storage and deposit libraries may be the key to solving storage problems in the future, it appears that research libraries will continue to rely on their own initiative and resources to alleviate space problems for some time to come.

* * *

The Kit on Remote Storage in ARL Libraries (No. 39, December 1977) contains 13 documents on general information, planning, and procedures (selection and retrieval), plus preliminary survey results and sample survey responses (112 pages). It is available for \$7.50 to SPEC subscribers and ARL members, and for \$15.00 to all others, prepayment requested.

REMOTE STORAGE IN ARL LIBRARIES

KIT #39 DECEMBER 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
SURVEY RESULTS	2
GENERAL INFORMATION AND DESCRIPTIONS	
Book Storage in Academic Libraries-- George Piternick. A report submitted to The Council on Library Resources	49
University of California, <u>Berkeley</u> , General Library. Storage Facility	59
PLANNING DOCUMENTS	
<u>Committee on the Transfer of Library Materials-</u> <u>Washington University</u>	67
<u>Princeton University Library Growth of the</u> <u>Collections 1965-85</u>	73
Revised Draft of statement on off-campus storage and memorandum-- <u>Cornell University</u>	82
PROCEDURES DOCUMENTS	
GENERAL PROCEDURES	
Procedures Manual-- <u>Princeton University</u>	93
Storage Systems Procedure-- <u>Univ. of Pittsburgh</u>	99
Tyson Valley Storage Procedures-- <u>Washington Univ.</u>	102
Storage Project: Stacks Books-- <u>McMaster Univ.</u>	106
SELECTION	
Circulation Analysis & Storage Decision Record-- <u>U.C. Davis</u>	111
Instructions for Selecting Candidates-- <u>Cornell</u>	112
Guidelines: Weeding for Withdrawal and Compact Storage-- <u>Washington State</u>	113
RETRIEVAL	
Procedures for Retrieval of Materials from Storage-- <u>Pittsburgh</u>	118

SURVEY RESULTS

A SURVEY OF COMPACT STORAGE FACILITIES AND COLLECTIONS
IN THE MEMBER LIBRARIES
OF THE ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES (ARL)

A PRELIMINARY REPORT

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, NY 14853

March 1, 1978

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Introduction</u>	i
<u>Summary of Chart Data</u>	
Description of Facilities	
I. Building	1
II. Size and Volume Capacity	1
III. Air Conditioning and Humidity Control	2
IV. Shelving	2
Characteristics of Compact Storage Collection	
I. Number of Volumes in the (Compact) Collection	3
II. Sizes Used in Compact Storage Collections	3
III. Notations Used to Identify Books in Storage Collections...	3
IV. What Records are Changed?	4
Selection	
I. Who Makes Decisions for Volumes to be Stored?	5
II. Criteria for Selection and Mechanics	5
Public Services	
I. Hours	7
II. On-Site Readers	7
III. Volumes Used Per Month	7
IV. Location of Records	7
V. Records Maintained in Storage Facilities	8
VI. Communication and Transportation	8
Staffing and Costs	
I. Number of Staff for Facility	9
II. Cost of Staff for Facilities	9
III. Number of Staff Needed for Changing Records	9
IV. Staff Assigned to... ..	10
<u>Charts</u>	
# 1. Description of Facility	
# 2. Shelving	
# 3. Methods of Compact Storage	
# 4. Selection	
# 5. Public Services	
# 6. Staffing and Costs	
# 7. Characteristics of Compact Storage	

Introduction

The Cornell University Libraries has conducted a survey of all member libraries of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) concerning their present compact storage facilities and collections. This survey was done in order to investigate various planning options and current practices in this important area of library management. A form (see attached) requesting information on 25 different aspects of compact storage facilities, collections, staffing costs and use was mailed to the membership and a response rate of 95 percent was realized.

All information received before November 9, 1977, was shared with the ARL Office of University Management Studies for the purpose of compiling SPEC Flyer No. 39 (December 1977) and SPEC Kit on "Remote Storage in ARL Libraries". Additional information received after that date was also analyzed and furnished to ARL.

The responses in general contained a wealth of information although they sometimes reflected unusual situations or lacked a necessary context or frame of reference. Lack of uniform definitions of job title, administrative organizations and processes added to the difficulty in tabulating results. Not all items could be answered by respondents, while others were misunderstood.

A separate analysis of each aspect of the survey has been completed but is not entirely satisfactory. For example, activities such as staffing, record changing and attendant costs were not meaningful when separated from the rest of the information. Varying conditions such as size, purpose and location of the stored collections finally determined staffing patterns and costs.

The reader should be aware of the basic differences in facilities described. Although the survey attempted to focus on compact storage facilities, responses showed that many facilities were merely storage and not compact storage in the true sense of the meaning. On the other hand, both the Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine described compact active collections. Much of the information supplied by these institutions was included since it would be of interest to any librarian planning compact storage facilities and collections. But for comparisons, Library of Congress and National Library of Medicine's costs would probably not be as useful in the storage collection context.

Summaries given on the charts are somewhat sketchy. The reader is encouraged to request copies of the completed survey forms for compact storage facilities of particular interest. Requests should be addressed to Ryburn M. Ross, Assistant Director for Technical and Automated Services, 201 Olin Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853. A minimum copying charge will be assessed for this purpose.

A bibliography on book storage has also been compiled and will soon be issued.

Prepared By:

Ryburn M. Ross
Assistant Director for Technical and
Automated Services
Project Director, Annex Library

Margaret Oaksford
Assistant Project Director, Annex Library

Description of Facilities

I. Building

A wide array of facilities were described as book storage areas. The most novel facilities described were "borrowed shelves" and "walls along a 180 foot long basement corridor in a non-public area". Basements were frequently mentioned sites (12 in library buildings, six in non-library buildings), while above ground areas of those having facilities on only one floor, numbered two. Seven libraries used present or former warehouses, while five libraries used vacated library facilities. Other arrangements (one each) included additions to present library, and an underground annex to a main building. Two respondents built special facilities and four other respondents used former store or factory buildings. Six respondents indicated more than one storage location which were usually in different types of buildings. Thirteen storage facilities were described as being distant from campuses; some of which could only be accessed by some means of vehicular transportation.

II. Size and Volume Capacity

Size comparisons were difficult to make because many respondents did not answer the question on size, while others gave linear (shelf) feet in some instances, and square feet in others. Using figures from respondents answering facility size both in square feet and volume capacity, a wide range of volume density was noted. The compact active collection in the Library of Congress showed the highest volume density per square foot: 30.4. The lowest volume density was 9.5 per square foot. The average number of volumes per square foot was 17.11, while the mean was 19.9. The wide range of densities may be attributed to the fact that some of the

storage collections were not compact. See section on Methods of Compact Storage Used.

III. Air Conditioning and Humidity Control

The presence or absence of air conditioning and humidity control depended largely upon the original intended use of the building now housing book storage. Four of five former library facilities reported air conditioning, while none of the warehouses reported air conditioning or humidity controls. Nine out of twelve book storage facilities housed in basements of present library buildings were air conditioned, but in basements of non-library buildings, three out of five lacked air conditioning. Most specially built storage facilities were air conditioned. Buildings built for other purposes such as for stores or factories were air conditioned according to original use; two stores were air conditioned, a factory was not. Of 22 respondents reporting air conditioning, only 10 also had humidity controls.

IV. Shelving

Several respondents indicated use of more than one type of shelving. Most used was standard steel library shelving (21). Reused shelving which varied from antique to modern was used in six storage centers. "Special compact" (Stormor drawers, Compactus, Lundia, Elecompak and drawers) were used by six libraries, sometimes in combination with standard shelving. Fixed wooden shelving, wooden bookcases, industrial shelving were mentioned two to three times each. Heights of shelves varied where they were indicated at all. Five respondents gave heights in terms of shelves, "six to nine shelves high." Height measurements ranged from 81 inches to 15 feet.

Characteristics of Compact Storage Collection

I. Number of Volumes in the (Compact) Collection

Sizes of stored collections varied greatly from a few thousand to over a million volumes. Nine respondents indicated collections of less than 100,000 volumes, while 13 respondents reported collections of between 100,000 to less than 300,000 volumes. Four respondents had collections of 300,000 to less than 500,000 volumes, while only four respondents had collections exceeding 500,000 volumes. The compact collections of L.C. and N.L.M. have been included although they are not storage collections.

II. Sizes Used in Compact Storage Collections

Only fifteen respondents indicated sizing books as a means of compact storage. The most popular number of sizes used was six (four respondents) with three respondents using three sizes. Two respondents (each) used four sizes and "several" undesignated sizes. One respondent used five sizes. In a separate study on book sizes made at the Cornell University Libraries, a chart showed that of the seven institutions compared, no two institutions used the same range of sizes. It may be concluded both from the questionnaire results and the separate study on sizes, that book sizing is a highly individual decision made at each institution.

III. Notations Used to Identify Books in Storage Collections

There were almost as many kinds of notations as there were respondents to

this section of the questionnaire. Notations appeared everywhere: on volumes, catalog or shelf list cards, CRT's, print-outs, circulation records, etc. Some respondents used more than one type of notation, while fourteen indicated that they shelved only by call number. The following notations are listed by type as nearly as possible:

Location designation	7
Letters	5
Location symbol on print-out, shelf list, etc.	5
Accession numbers	5
Size code	4
Color code	2
Plastic overlay on catalog cards	2
"Request at Circulation" on CRT	1
Information tab in front of catalog card	1

IV. What Records are Changed?

Fourteen respondents did not change any records for stored material. Others changed one or more types of records in varying combinations. Catalog card/serial records were mentioned nine times, while the shelf list record was mentioned only five times. Circulation records and/or various print-outs were each used by four respondents. Other records changed included: OCLC file (1), Kardex (2), institutional union list of serials (1), and additional record created (2).

Selection

I. Who Makes Decisions for Volumes to be Stored?

Divisional and branch librarians most often make decisions as to which titles/volumes are to be stored (13), although bibliographers and collection development staff also played a strong role in selection for storage. There were many combinations of selectors; e.g. subject specialty librarians and faculty, selection and public service staff, bibliographers and information librarians, etc. Consultation of faculty was mentioned in only five instances. In general, the library staff or administration make the individual selections, although three respondents indicated use of set policies to follow rather than individual selection. The following table indicates the number of libraries using any given group of staff or policies:

Divisional and branch librarians	13
Collection development staff	6
Staff	5
Faculty	5
Set policies	3
Bibliographers	4
Reference staff	3
Loan department	2
Catalog department	1
Public services staff	1
Technical services staff	1

II. Criteria for Selection and Mechanics

Criteria for selection varied with conditions in individual libraries. Some libraries indicated several criteria while others gave no criteria. Little used materials was most often mentioned (21 times), while pre- (cut-off date) was the

next used criteria (10 times). Superannuated or out-of-date (no special date) materials and hard copy moved to storage when microfilm became available were mentioned by five libraries. Duplicates, condition, imprints and language of text each were mentioned twice. Other criteria mentioned once each were oversize materials, space needs, staff knowledge, importance of a given title, condition of volumes, and out-of-collection-scope materials.

Public Services

I. Hours

Most respondents indicated that the storage facilities were open for service during regular library hours, but not necessarily to the public. One facility was open regularly less than daily, and five other facilities opened for service upon demand. In the latter instances, there were no public reading facilities.

II. On-Site Readers

Fourteen respondents stated that no reading facilities were available for on-site readers. Three respondents indicated presence of reading facilities but had no numbers of users. Two other respondents served their readers from their regular reading rooms. One facility with a reading room served over 1,000 readers a year, another close to 3,000, and still another served less than 50.

III. Volumes Used Per Month

The number of volumes used from storage collections varied greatly depending upon the size and convenience of the storage facility. Large facilities circulated between 1,000--3,000 volumes a month. Nine respondents showed stored material circulation of less than 500 a month, while nine others circulated less than 100 per month.

IV. Location of Records

The catalog and circulation records were sometimes held only in the main library. Other libraries had records in both places. A breakdown has been made

of the kinds of records and the location.

In the library proper, seventeen respondents noted storage holdings in their main catalogs and/or department library catalogs. Three others marked their shelf lists while two (each) used computer print-outs and a library union list of serials. Mentioned once each were circulation file records and records on fiche.

V. Records Maintained in Storage Facilities

Since many respondents indicated that there were no reading facilities in their storage sites, catalog cards were seldom used. Four respondents noted shelf lists--one being on fiche; while the rest (one each) indicated a small out-of-date catalog, a charge file in call number order, a circulation list; and for one facility now being planned, a catalog on microfiche (COM).

VI. Communication and Transportation

Means of communication depended upon distance and accessibility. Ten facilities had telephones, and ten used pages and/or staff for messages. When storage was in the library building itself, phone, pneumatic tubes, intercom, elevators, book conveyors or simply staff members and pages were used for both communication and transportation. One storage facility had open access.

Storage facilities which were somewhat distant from their libraries used motor vehicles which belonged to the university, the library or a cooperative. Library staff/pages walked to nearby facilities to provide service. Book conveyors, dumbwaiters, service elevators were used to transport materials from storage facilities located in the main library buildings.

Staffing and Costs

I. Number of Staff for Facility

Not all institutions had dedicated storage facility staff. Of the respondents, 13 stated that staff from other departments, most commonly circulation or department library staff, serviced the storage facilities. For those facilities with dedicated staff, most had less than two up to two FTE (9). Five respondents had less than one up to one FTE; two respondents had less than three up to three FTE; while three respondents had less than four up to four FTE. One large facility had circa 24 FTE. (The Library of Congress and the National Library of Medicine were not included in these counts.)

II. Cost of Staff for Facilities

Costs for facilities with dedicated staff ranged greatly because the level of the staff varied from a few hours of student assistant help to regular staff with a professional librarian. For cost comparisons, it is necessary to refer to the charts for context. A number of respondents were unable to separate out staff costs for various reasons.

III. Number of Staff Needed for Changing Records

There was little information about the number of staff needed for changing records. As could be noted from the question "What records are changed?", the amount and kind of record changes differed from place to place. Twenty-four respondents had no figures available while in another 14 instances, the question

did not apply. Four respondents indicated the records were changed by catalog or serial departments; one by the department library; four used one FTE; three used student assistants, and two used librarians. This question needs to be read in its complete context to be meaningful.

IV. Staff Assigned to...

Twenty-two respondents indicated to whom storage staff was assigned. Eleven of these were assigned to circulation departments, while four were assigned to department libraries. Two respondents each showed staff assigned to user services, a special board and catalog departments. Single responses showed staff assigned to the Assistant University Librarian, the building manager, the mail room, photoduplication department, reference department and periodicals department.

DESCRIPTION OF FACILITY

CHART 1 -- Pg. 1

Institution	Building(s)	Size (Sq. Ft.)	Capacity (Volumes)	Air Condit'g and/or Humidity Cont.	Remarks
University of California (Berkeley & Davis)	Former Ford assembly plant at Richmond, Calif. Serves the University of Calif. at Berkeley, Davis, San Francisco and Santa Cruz.	56,000	700,000	Neither	--
Colorado State University	Leased warehouse, fireproof and locked.	--	c.300,000	Neither	--
University of Connecticut	Basement and 3rd floor of an on-campus warehouse.	12,080	c.115,000	Neither	--
Emory University	Storage available in Woodruff Library, but so far has been used by professional schools only.	--	--	--	--
Indiana University School of Medicine	Storage area added to basement stack level.	984	c.26,460	Air Cond.	--
University of Iowa	In Main Library basement.	--	275,000	Available	Storage, not compact.
Johns Hopkins University	Stack areas of former library building.	--	350,000	Partially	Storage, not compact.
Library of Congress	Basement and subbasement of the James Madison Memorial Building. Planned.	98,000	2,975,000	Both	Compact <u>active</u> collection.
National Library of Medicine.	Three levels below ground of library building.	30 1/2 ft. ranges	80,000	Air Cond.	Part of closed stack working collection.
University of North Carolina	Uses "borrowed shelves", other storage 10 miles distant.	--	--	--	Have new stack addition.
Northwestern University	Basement in Main Library	14,300	293,000	Both	Area planned as a compact facility.
University of Pittsburgh	Basement in building several blocks from library.	--	n/a	Neither	--
Queen's University	None, but planning to have a separate building on campus.	--	200,000	Both planned.	Being planned.

Institution	Building(s)	Size (Sq. Ft.)	Capacity (Volumes)	Air Condit'g and/or Humidity Cont.	Remarks
University of So. California	Subsurface level nine-tier stacks in the University Library.	--	200,000	Neither	Designed as closed storage area.
Southern Illinois University	Below ground stack level and area in former factory.	--	22,000	Library only.	Storage, not compact.
Virginia Poly. State University	Leased vacant department store.	16,000	250,000	Air Cond.	Five miles from campus.
Washington State University	Basement of Holland Library	4,873.5	c.54,720	Air Cond.	Figures calculated from information supplied.
University of Washington	Basement of building on central campus.	3,000	48,000	Neither	--
University of Wisconsin	Basement stacks of library	--	500,000	Chilled water.	--
Yale University	Underground stacks in annex to main library building.	--	223,800	Air Cond.	Filled. No new plans to date.
University of California, Los Angeles	Parts of four stack levels in Powell; formerly main library. Also leased warehouse.	--	c.509,000	Powell=yes Warehouse=no	--
Harvard University	Cooperatively maintained rented warehouse; the New England Deposit Library. Total capacity of facility: 1,000,000 volumes.	--	335,000 (Harvard)	Neither	Located 30 min. distant from main library.
University of Michigan	Four-story stack building on North Campus of the University of Michigan.	--	400-450,000	Stacks only.	--
University of Missouri	Small supermarket two blocks from library	11,000	250,000	Air Cond.	--
Wayne State University	A basement and a storage building. A third site being planned.	11,000	470,000; 200,000 in storage	Both in library; neither in storage.	--
National Library of Canada Periodicals	5th floor of main library building, one level below the main periodical section.	17,290 lin. ft.	--	Both	See questionnaire
Foreign & Internat'l Off. Pub. Sect.	Third Basement in main library building.	1,344 lin.ft.	--	Both	See questionnaire
University of Chicago	Basement stacks in Harper (old) library bldg.	--	425,000	Neither	--

Description of Facility (continued)

CHART 1 -- Pg. 3

Institution	Building(s)	Size (Sq. Ft.)	Capacity (Volumes)	Air Condit'ng and/or Humidity Cont.	Remarks
Case Western Reserve					
Sears Library	8th floor of the Glennan Building	3,360	--	Air Cond.	9,786 shelf ft.
Freiberger Library	"Another university building, 250 ft. distant." Two stories.	3,000	50-60,000	Neither	--
McMaster University	Basement and subbasement of Mills Art Library; also basement in Science-Engineering Library.	--	c.112,000	Neither	--
University of Minnesota	Seven Stack levels in Walter Library	80,597 lin. ft. quarto; 93,316 lin. ft. octavo.	--	Neither	--
Washington University	Tyson Research Center, 25 miles from campus.	--	--	--	Gives measurements but not of shelves.
University of Hawaii	Storage now in other buildings. Awaiting 6th floor addition.	--	--	Air Cond.	--
John Crerar Library	Warehouse space.	2,800	850,000	Neither	Part of regular collections.
Dartmouth	Proposed: Fire resistant, warehouse type of building. Expected to be a cooperative.	--	c.500,000	Both planned?	--
University of Western Ontario	Basement of a campus building .25 miles from campus. Called RDL.	8,820	200,000	Air Cond.	Also has workroom.
Rice University	Along both walls of a corridor 7 ft.6 in. by 180 ft. in a non/public area.	1,350	11-19,000 depending on book & shelf size.	Air Cond.	--
University of Texas at Austin	Six-story concrete building, three basements, three floors above ground.	--	1,194,000	Air Cond.	--
University of Toronto	First basement level, Robarts Library	--	200,000	Air Cond.	--
Princeton University	Separate building constructed for compact storage--located on the Forrestal Campus 2 miles from main library.	13,000 expand to 26,000	432,000	Both	Expandable to 732,000 volumes on two levels.

Description of Facility (continued)

CHART 1 -- Pg. 4

Institution	Building(s)	Size (Sq. Ft.)	Capacity (Volumes)	Air Condit'ng and/or Humidity Cont.	Remarks
Cornell University					
Present	Lower level in main library	2,300	100,000	Both	Lower level of library planned for compact storage.
Planned	Annex Library--separate warehouse-type building designed for compact storage of book and archival material.	30,000	400-600,000; 17,000 archival boxes	Both	Located on periphery of campus in new warehouse complex, 2 miles distant from main library.
Boston Public	Cooperatively maintained warehouse-- New England Deposit Library. Total capacity of facility: 1,000,000 volumes.	--	146,800 bks. 10,000 news- paper vols.	Air Cond.	Located 4 miles from main library.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Cooperatively maintained warehouse-- New England Deposit Library. Total capacity of facility: 1,000,000 volumes.	--	n/a	Air Cond.	Located 15 minutes from main library.
Louisiana State University	Six-level stack area in old Hill Memorial Library.	--	100,000	Both	Building designed for 60,000 vols. Presently has 100,000 stored.
Stanford University	Auxiliary stacks which are two stack areas of the old Law Library. Located in main quad on campus.	--	--	None, only natural air, no windows.	--

3/1/78

SHELVING

CHART 2 - Pg. 1

Institution	Standard Library	Industrial	Special Compact	Height	Depth & Width	Remarks
University of California (Berkeley & Davis)	--	Modified, 4' modules	--	7'	--	28 1/2" aisles
Colorado State University	Wooden, non-adjustable	--	--	--	--	--
University of Connecticut	Steel storage shelving	--	--	"6-7 shelves high"	18" x 3'	Books shelved on both sides of shelf.
Emory University	--	--	--	--	--	--
Indiana University School of Medicine	--	--	Elecompact manual	90"	20 1/2" x 9'	See questionnaire.
University of Iowa	Steel, 8 shelves per section.	--	--	96"	? x 34"	--
Johns Hopkins	Sneed shelving c.1,900	--	--	"7 shelves"	8" x 3'	24" aisles.
Library of Congress	Modified bracket shelving.	--	--	96" or 105"	Varies	--
National Library of Medicine	Remington Rand	--	Elecompact.	"7 shelves"	--	Conventional and compact.
University of North Carolina	Various kinds of temporary shelving.	Various kinds of temporary shelving.	Various kinds of temporary shelving.	--	--	--
Northwestern University	Estey	--	--	7'2"	? x 3'	29" aisle.
University of Pittsburgh	"Old shelving"	--	--	105"	9" x 3'	--
Queen's University	--	Planning industrial shelving.	--	--	--	"Industrial shelving with narrow aisles"
University of So. California	"Standard"	--	--	--	--	--
Southern Illinois University	"Standard lib."	--	--	90"	8" & 10" x 3'	32"-36" aisles.
Virginia Poly. State University	"Standard"	--	--	--	--	"30 aisles" (34" wide cf. plan.)

Shelving (continued)

CHART 2 - Pg. 2

Institution	Standard Library	Industrial	Special Compact	Height	Depth & Width	Remarks
Washington State University	"Standard"	--	--	--	--	-24" aisles.
University of Washington	Wooden adjustable.	--	--	max. 81"	Mixture.	Was custom made.
University of Wisconsin	--	--	"Drawers"	15'	--	Open access.
Yale University	Standard	--	--	--	--	"narrow aisles"
University of California, Los Angeles	Art Metal. Ames Virginia Metal.	--	--	"standard"	"standard"	--
Harvard University	Fixed wooden shelving.	--	--	--	--	At NEDL
University of Michigan	Standard stack	--	Stor-Mor Drawers	--	--	--
University of Missouri	Standard	--	--	109"	--	--
Wayne State University	Purdy & Pontiac facility: standard shelving. Also science building.	--	--	"shelves high"	--	High shelving at Science Library only.
National Library of Canada Periodicals	--	--	3 ranges Compactus, + other moving units using old shelving.	--	--	See questionnaire
Foreign & Internat'l Off. Pub. Sect.	Not clear--see questionnaire	--	--	--	--	--
University of Chicago	Standard old shelving	--	--	--	--	--
Case Western Reserve Sears Library	"Standard"	--	--	--	--	--
Freiberg Library	Standard metal library shelving.	--	--	--	--	--
McMaster University (Mills)	--	--	--	--	--	"Compact shelving"

Shelving (continued)

CHART 2 - Pg. 3

Institution	Standard Library	Industrial	Special Compact	Height	Depth & Width	Remarks
University of Minnesota	"conventional metal"	--	--	--	--	--
Washington University	Reused metal library shelving	--	--	--	--	--
University of Hawaii	Standard library	--	--	--	--	Being planned.
John Crerar Library	--	Industrial	--	"9 shelves high"	--	--
Dartmouth	--	--	--	--	--	Being planned.
University of Western Ontario	Standard library, 8", 10", 12" shelves	--	--	--	--	c. 8 shelves per section
Rice University	Old wooden book-cases	--	--	Varies	Varies	--
University of Texas at Austin	Estey	--	--	90"	10" x 3'	Various sizes.
University of Toronto	--	--	Lundia wooden compact "full space" shelving.	--	--	--
Princeton University	--	Hallowell shelving.	--	7'6"	12" & 14" widths	--
Cornell University						
Present	Standard library	--	--	8'4"	3'6" center	--
Planned	--	Hallowell	--	7'4"	18", 24", 30" depth (dbl. shelves)	--
Boston Public	Fixed wooden & fixed metal	--	--	8'4"	7' x 3'	--

Shelving (continued)

7
CHAPT 2 - Pg. 4

Institution	Standard Library	Industrial	Special Compact	Height	Depth & Width	Remarks
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Fixed wooden shelving	--	--	8 shelves high	--	--
Louisiana State University	Multi-tier permanent shelving.	--	--	--	--	--
Stanford University	Standard library shelving	--	--	Varies	Varies	--

3/1/78

36

023

35

BEST COPY

METHODS OF COMPACT STORAGE USED

CHART 3 -- Pg. 1

Institution	High Shelves	Narrow Aisles	Motorized/ Moveable Shelving	Book Size	Fore Edge Shelving	Remarks
University of California (Berkeley & Davis)	--	X	--	X	--	--
Colorado State University	--	--	--	--	--	--
University of Connecticut	--	X	--	--	--	Storage; not compact. Aisle width generally 30".
Emory University	--	--	--	--	--	Available, but not used.
Indiana University School of Medicine	--	--	Elecompact	--	--	--
University of Iowa	--	--	--	--	--	Vol. once on shelf becomes a fixed location.
Johns Hopkins	--	--	--	--	--	Storage, not compact.
Library of Congress	--	--	--	X	--	Compact active collection.
National Library of Medicine	X	--	Elecompact	--	--	--
University of North Carolina	--	--	--	--	--	Temporary storage.
Northwestern University	--	X	--	--	--	29" aisles.
University of Pittsburgh	--	X	--	--	--	Used old library shelving.
Queen's University	X	X	--	X	--	In planning stages.
University of So. California	X	--	--	X	--	--
Southern Illinois University	--	--	--	--	--	Storage; not compact.
Virginia Poly. State University	--	--	--	--	--	Arranged by call no. in packed shelving. Storage; not compact.

Institution	High Shelves	Narrow Aisles	Motorized/ Moveable Shelving	Book Size	Fore Edge Shelving	Remarks
Washington State University	X	--	--	X	--	--
University of Washington	--	--	--	--	--	Will use existing equipment in an unused building.
University of Wisconsin	X	--	Drawers	--	--	--
Yale University	--	--	--	X	X	--
University of California, Los Angeles	--	--	--	4 sizes	--	"Shelved on spine"
Harvard University	X	X	--	8 sizes	--	--
University of Michigan	--	--	Stor/mor & stand, shelving	X	--	Book Size: no details given.
University of Missouri	X	X	--	up to 36cm; 37 cm+ over-size.	--	--
Wayne State University	--	X	Proposed for new facility.	--	--	Storage no. which includes size: STORAGE 1722 20cm.
National Library of Canada Periodicals	--	X	Compactus, 3 ranges regular & 1 range folio.	--	--	"All books shelved upright."
Foreign & Internat'l Off. Pub. Sect.	--	--	--	--	--	Not clear. See questionnaire
University of Chicago	--	--	--	X; compact collection only.	--	Used existing facility with standard old lib. shelving.
Case Western Reserve	--	--	--	--	--	--
Sears Library	--	--	--	--	--	Not "compact" storage?
Freiberg Library	--	--	--	--	--	Not "compact" storage?

Institution	High Shelves	Narrow Aisles	Motorized/Moveable Shelving	Book Size	Fore Edge Shelving	Remarks
McMaster University (Mills)	--	--	--	--	--	"Compact" shelving used not described.
University of Minnesota	--	--	--	2 sizes	--	--
Washington University	--	--	--	--	--	Storage, <u>might</u> be compact shelves.
University of Hawaii	--	--	--	--	--	"LC no. sequence, filled 100%.
John Crerar Library	--	--	--	--	--	Pre-1946 material until shelves full.
Louisiana State University	--	--	--	--	--	So far shelved in call no. order.
Dartmouth	--	--	--	Like Princeton.	--	Size and call no.; plans only.
University of Western Ontario	--	X	--	--	--	Monographs and serials separated. Use call no. sequence. 23" aisles.
Rice University	--	--	--	--	--	Shelved in call no. order, not size. Where shelf depth and vol. size permits, shelved two rows deep.
University of Texas at Austin	--	--	--	5 sizes	--	--
University of Toronto	--	--	Lundia, full space shelving.	--	--	"By date"
Princeton	--	X	--	X	--	--
Cornell University						
Present	X	X	--	6 sizes	--	--
Planned	X	X	--	4 sizes	--	Aisle width varies.

Institution	High Shelves	Narrow Aisles	Motorized/ Moveable Shelving	Book Size	Fore Edge Shelving	Remarks
Boston Public	X	X	--	--	--	Arranged in shelf order by call no.; not by size.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	X	X	--	--	--	--
Louisiana State University	X	--	--	--	--	--
Stanford University	--	X	--	--	--	Aisle width varies, depending on building. Shelves used are all standard 8-inch shelves.

3/1/78

43

44

BEST COPY

SELECTION

CHART 4 -- Pg. 1

Institution	Who Makes Decisions for Volumes to be Stored?	Criteria for Selection	Mechanics for Selection	Remarks
University of California (Berkeley & Davis)	Asst. Univ. Librarian, subject specialists, Loan Dept. faculty.	Superannuated eds., older monographs related to coll. in branches, or large subj. groups unused dup. copies, lack of use.	Continuing shelf service.	--
Colorado State University	Subj. spec. librarians & faculty	Past use, predicted future use, imprint & language of titles.	Identified by subj. spec., reviewed by fac., process slips sent to Circ. Dept.	--
University of Connecticut	Library staff, public & technical services	"Least amount of inconvenience to patrons. Smallest amount of record keeping."	Title-by-title review of journals, monog. receiving least no. of circulations.	--
Emory University	--	--	--	--
Indiana University School of Medicine	Professional library staff.	Serials discont. prior to 1970, outdated ref. books.	(same as criteria)	--
University of Iowa	Dept. librarians and faculty.	Out-of-date monog.; earlier years of serials.	List of items for consideration is circulated among faculty. Decisions made after faculty comment evaluated.	--
Johns Hopkins	Collection Development librarians & faculty.	Low-use journals; journals currently being considered for replacement on microfilm.	Coll. Dev. Librn. suggestions circ. to staff.	No less than one shelf of material per title.
Library of Congress	Not applicable. Stacks for active collection and not storage.	Selected on basis of assignments of functions to JMCB and appro. of compact bookstacks for certain coll.	By designated subj. categories. <u>Not storage.</u>	--
National Library of Medicine	No person. Uses set guidelines.	Year of publication and placement in alphabet.	Shelf list order.	--

Institution	Who Makes Decisions for Volumes to be Stored?	Criteria for Selection	Mechanics for Selection	Remarks
University of North Carolina	--	--	--	--
Northwestern University	Dept. librarians.	Pre-1945 and pre-1955 and low-use journals; low-use monographs.	Vols. identified, pulled from shelves and stamped. Moved to Circ. Dept.	--
University of Pittsburgh	Bibliographers and information librarians.	Books non-circ. last 25 yrs.; certain classes only.	See outline.	--
Queen's University	Librarian in charge, and faculty.	Pre-1971 items cataloged and not circulated since. Other criteria may apply.	--	--
University of So. California	Bibliographers, branch librs., Head of Circ.	Monog.--no circ. for 10 yrs. exceptional duplicates.	Selection done only when need for space arises.	No firm criteria developed.
Southern Illinois University	Head of each of the 4 subj. divisional libs.	19th-20th cent. bound periodical files.	"Little used journals and especially in esoteric languages."	
Virginia Poly. State University	Heads of subj div. with subj. librarians., with coordination and response of Head of Ref./ Coll. Dev.	Less frequently used periodicals; Dewey collection (pre-1965)	3 x 5 card with title and span of years indicated. Pulled by student assts.	--
Washington State University	"Consultation between appropriate staff & div. heads."	No uniform set of criteria.	See attachments to questionnaire.	--
University of Washington	n/a	n/a	n/a	No information.
University of Wisconsin	--	--	--	No information.
Yale University	Library staff	"Selective Book Retiring Program" (9-page outline)	--	Criteria contained in outline too long to be reproduced here.

Institution	Who Makes Decisions for Volumes to be Stored?	Criteria for Selection	Mechanics for Selection	Remarks
University of California, Los Angeles	Bibliographic control unit of Tech. Serv. in consultation with selection officers.	Varies. See questionnaire.	Varies	--
Harvard University	Librarian for Collection Development.	Appears to have been less frequently used materials, e.g. variant eds. of voluminous authors, translations from original earlier eds. of textbooks, serials, out-of-scope materials, books on poor paper.	--	--
University of Michigan	Divisional librarians, collective for Grad. Lib.	Materials too important to withdraw but little used or in poor condition.	--	--
University of Missouri	Library staff & faculty	Pre-1960 Devey materials in science & tech.; pre-1960 dissertations, oversize, older law material.	--	--
Wayne State University	Professional staff	All new pre-1967 imprints go to storage. Coll. review. Journals: pre-1960. Deviations as necessary.	Librarians weed collections.	--
National Library of Canada Periodicals	Head of Periodicals.	Dead titles not in heavy demand for ILL or local use.	Kardex clerks compile lists of dead titles. Historic backlogs identified by Head for transfer.	--
Foreign & Internat'l Off. Pub. Sect.	Section head with input from staff.	Little used material.	--	--
University of Chicago	Bibliographers and book selectors.	Low use.	--	--

Institution	Who Makes Decisions for Volumes to be Stored?	Criteria for Selection	Mechanics for Selection	Remarks
Case Western Reserve Sears Library	Head librarian/consulting ref. librarians/Systems & Research staff.	Space needs, use, dates, kind of material.	Lack of use, judgment of librarians, selection of reasonable data, faculty opinion.	--
Freiberger Library	Head of Ref. Dept.: Docs. Lib., Head Librn./consulting Coll. Dev. & Pub. Serv. Librns.	Low-use, long-run dupl. Hard copy material avail. microforms.	Done as needed.	--
McMaster University (Mills)	Co-ordinator of Circ. Services, Documents Librn, Serials Librn.	Use, books of which there are 2 or more editions or copies.	Stacks staff turns down books not circ. for 3 yrs. Reviewed by Circ. Librn. Faculty consulted on selection.	--
University of Minnesota	Depository Libraries.	Little-used materials.	Look at charge card; type storage record & storage shelf list.	--
Washington University	Collection Policy Committee and other committees.	Non-current titles; texts superceded by microtexts little-used materials, vols. which could withstand transport backfiles of current serials.	Titles may be recommended for transfer by Bibliographers, departmental librarians, Acq./Serials Dept. Chief, Circ. Dept. Chief.	--
University of Hawaii	Science-Technology bibliographer and reference staff.	Serial sets published prior to 1950 known to be less frequently used than other titles.	--	--
John Crerar Library	Administrative Council set the policy.	Beginning with 000, selecting all material published prior to 1946.	See Criteria.	--
Dartmouth	Selection and public services staff.	--	--	In planning stages only.

Selection (continued)

CHART 4 -- Pg. 5

Institution	Who Makes Decisions for Volumes to be Stored?	Criteria for Selection	Mechanics for Selection	Remarks
University of Western Ontario	Collection Development staff.	Frequency of use, individual staff knowledge, intrinsic importance of a title to subj. or discipline.	Items selected by Collections staff sent to compact storage. Circ. records undated to show new location.	
Rice University	Catalog Department	Runs of seldom used serials which the library has on microfilm.	When microfilm is received printed form is considered for storage.	
University of Texas at Austin	Librarian in charge of dept. library.	Criteria determined by Librarian in charge. Considerable variation.	Varies according to staff.	Dept. libs. only at this point. Perry-Castaneda Lib. will not need for some time.
University of Toronto	East Asian Librarian.	Lack of use, continuation of journals already in storage.	--	--
Princeton University	Those responsible for collection development including library staff, faculty and students.	Titles expected unused.	--	Response received January 1972.
Cornell University Present	Libraries staff members.	1. Outdated textbooks. 2. Literature-older ed. in all languages. 3. Many publication in sci. 4. Many foreign & domestic dissertations. 5. Obsolete bks in all fields. 6. Many bound, boarded, or boxed pamphlets.	--	--
Proposed	Departmental librarian, bibliographers; review by Asst. Dir. for Coll. Dvlpmt.; faculty consultation on policy.	Little use, obsolescence, need for limited circ. (plates, binding, etc.)	Cards prepared by selector; searched; submitted to Asst. Dir. for Coll. Dvlpmt. for final review.	Serial runs of minimum 5 yrs. or 3 linear ft. considered.

Selection (continued)

CHART 4 -- Pg. 6

Institution	Who Makes Decisions for Volumes to be Stored?	Criteria for Selection	Mechanics for Selection	Remarks
Boston Public	Asst. Director of Research Lib. in consultation with dept. heads.	Low useage.	"NEDL" added to card as serials & govt. documents are added to S.L.	--
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Divisional librarians.	Little used materials.	--	--
Louisiana State University	Division heads in the 3 public service divisions.	Little used backruns of journals; short runs of older titles; superceded reference works.	--	--
Stanford University	Joint decision between interested selectors, assistant directors, and Chief Circulation Librarian. Major initial decisions approved by Director of Libraries.	Main stack collections by entire Dewey class. (except 510 & 600). Main stack serials dead before 1970 & cataloged in Dewey. Lesser used materials from branches & depts. in desperate need for space.	"Units needing space were asked to submit candidate collections & suggestions which were reviewed and approved by Associate Director."	--

3/1/78

033

55

56

BEST COPY

PUBLIC SERVICES

CHART 5 -- Pg. 1

Institution	Communications Mode	Transportation Mode	Hours Open	Location of Records	No. of In-Person Readers	Volumes Used Per Month
University of California (Berkeley & Davis)	Telephone	Storage Library Wagon	8--12; 1--5 M--F	s.l.	3--20 stations	ca. 2,000
Colorado State University	None	Car & railroad	6 hrs. weekly	Computer print-out	None	150
University of Connecticut	None	Ford economy van	As needed. Delivery service once per day.	None at facility.	No provision for this.	1,400 annually
Emory University	--	--	--	--	--	--
Indiana University School of Medicine	Open access to the public.	--	Regular library hours.	None at facility.	Use regular facilities.	No statistics available.
University of Iowa	Accessed by staff in same bldg.	--	Regular library hours.	None at facility.	2--3 per month	40--50
Johns Hopkins	Telephone	On foot	8:30--5, M--F	Main library.	None	150
Library of Congress (planned)	Pneumatic tube.	Book conveyor	Library hours.	Main & dept. catalog	Will be closed for readers.	ca. 35,000
National Library of Medicine	--	Dumbwaiter	Library hours.	Main catalog.	--	ca. 26,000
University of North Carolina	--	--	--	--	--	--
Northwestern University	None	Service elevator.	8:30--4:40, M--F	None at facility.	1 per month	ca. 80
University of Pittsburgh	None	University truck	Upon demand.	Main Library	--	ca. 1
Queen's University (planned)	--	Library truck	Library hours.	Printout	--	--

Public Services (continued)

CHART 5 -- Pg. 2

Institution	Communications Mode	Transportation Mode	Hours Open	Location of Records	No. of In-Person Readers	Volumes Used Per Month
University of So. California	Intercom to Circ.	None required.	Library hours.	s.l. in facility	Closed to readers.	ca. 350
Southern Illinois University	None	4 elevators, 2 stairwells.	Library hours.	None at facility	No record	ca. 2 or 3
Virginia Poly. State University	Telephone	Library delivery van.	--	None at facility.	None	ca. 2,000--3,000
Washington State University	Telephone	Pneumatic tube, book lift	Library hours.	s.l.	--	--
University of Washington (planned)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
University of Wisconsin	Elevators and book conveyor.	--	Regular library hours.	Union catalog.	Not known. Area has open access.	1,750
Yale University	Serviced by Circulation Desk.	--	8:30--5, M--F	None at facility	--	450--650
University of California, Los Angeles	Loan Dept. pages.	Being developed for warehouse.	Powell: 8--5, M--F. Warehouse as needed.	None at facility	--	ca. 400
Harvard University	Telephone	Daily messenger service.	9--5, M--F	Small, out-of-date cat. in facility.	--	ca. 3,000
University of Michigan	Telephone	Daily pick-up	8--4:30, M--F	Shelf list & circ. file.	ca. 112 monthly.	ca. 1,100
University of Missouri	Daily delivery vans. twice daily.	Delivery vans.	8--5, M--F	At facility, microfiche s.l.	No experience.	No experience.
Wayne State University	Telephone	Paging & van.	Library hours.	Shelf list at facility.	--	Purdy: 20% of total circ. Warehouse, 800.

Public Services (continued)

CHART 5 -- Pg. 3

Institution	Communications Mode	Transportation Mode	Hours Open	Location of Records	No. of In-Person Readers	Volumes Used Per Month
National Library of Canada						
Periodicals	Elevator, booklift and stairs	--	Library hours.	Public catalog.	--	ca. 75-100
Foreign & Internat'l Off. Pub. Sect.	Same as above.	--	8--6, M--F	Public cat.	Reading room.	n/a
University of Chicago	On site, on demand paging.	--	8:30--5, M--F	Public catalog "Fractional shelf list"	--	275
Case Western Reserve						
Sears Library	Telephone	Paging	None	At Sears	Very rare	ca. 49
Freiberger Library	Paging	Paging	No public hrs.	At Freiburger	10-12	20-30
McMaster University (Mills)	Paging	--	None	None at facility	--	ca. 300
University of Minnesota	Telephone (?)	Paging	8--4:30, M--F; 1 hr. Sat.	Card cat.	n/a	ca. 1,206
Washington University Not yet in operation?	Request form/ messenger	--	--	--	--	--
University of Hawaii	To be serviced by Sci. & Tech. staff.	--	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
John Crerar Library	None	Public transp. & lib. stat. wagon.	Not open	Public catalog	None	150-175
Dartmouth (Being Planned)	--	--	Will be 9--5, M--F. Evenings 5-8.	COM, eventually entire Dart- mouth catalog.	--	--

036

61

BEST COPY

62

Public Services (continued)

CHART 5 -- Pg. 4

Institution	Communications Mode	Transportation Mode	Hours Open	Location of Records	No. of In-Person Readers	Volumes Used Per Month
University of Western Ontario	Telephone & mail	Library truck	9--5, M--F	Library; system microfiche ULS & computer list. Mono. in s.l. order.	2 per year.	75
Rice University	--	On foot.	Open by staff	Circ. list only.	10 per month	10
University of Texas at Austin	Telephone	Univ. truck	8--5, M--F	Chg. file Call # order.	n/a	3,348 per <u>year</u>
University of Toronto	None within library.	--	Library staff only.	East Asian catalog.	n/a	3 British patents per year. East Asia, 25 volumes.
Princeton University	2 phones; also answering machine for phone requests.	Library truck	8:30--4:30, M--F	Shelflist at facility	--	300
Cornell University						
Present	None	Paging	Same as main collection.	None at facility; main card cat.	None	175
Proposed	Telephone & mail	Library truck	To be determined.	Shelflist at facility (proposed)	--	--
Boston Public	Telephone	Delivery service	9--4:45, M--F	s.l. at facility	20--25 per month.	200 per month are recalled in Central Lib. 3,000 per year used at facility.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Telephone	Messenger using Harvard truck.	9--5, M--F	Catalog at facility	--	--

037

63

64

BEST COPY

Public Services (continued)

CHART 5 -- Pg. 5

Institution	Communications Mode	Transportation Mode	Hours Open	Location of Records	No. of In- Person Readers	Volumes Used Per Month
Louisiana State University	None	Elevator within building.	7:30--4, M--F	No records at facility for public use.	2,892 per year	650
Stanford University	Telephone	Paged & returned on book trucks wheeled across campus.	No public access hours. Both stack areas are serviced 3 times per day.	None at facility. Master list of uncataloged material for paging & reshelving purposes only.	None (no public access)	1,100

3/1/78

65

038

66

BEST COPY

STAFFING & COSTS

CHART 6 — Pg. 1

Institution	Number of Staff for Facility	Cost of Staff	Number of Staff for Changing Records	Cost of Changing Records	Staff Assigned To
University of California (Berkeley & Davis)	3.5 FTE	—	None	None	Assistant University Librarian
Colorado State University	1/2--1 FTE	\$325 per month	n/a	n/a	Circulation & Prep'n Departments
University of Connecticut	1/3 FTE	—	—	—	Circulation Department
Emory University	—	—	—	—	—
Indiana University School of Medicine	Special staff not required.	Facility not staffed by special staff.	Done by Catalog & Serial Dept.	n/a	Catalog Dept. handles books. Serials Dept. handles serials.
University of Iowa	1 Clerk from Circulation.	n/a	Done by each unit sending material.	n/a	Circulation.
Johns Hopkins	2 FTE	\$15,200	1 FTE & part-time student.	—	Building Manager & Circulation Dept.
Library of Congress	18--19 FTE	\$175,000	None	None	Law Lib. & Music Divisions
National Library of Medicine	Regular staff	Same as other portions of collection.	Loan & stack section regular staff.	n/a	n/a
University of North Carolina	—	—	—	—	—
Northwestern University	Staff from Circulation.	\$2,200 annum	—	ca. \$425 annum	Circulation
University of Pittsburgh	Regular staff	None	None	None	Mail Room & Circulation
Queen's University	Planning--	—	1 FTE	—	Undecided.

68

BEST COPY

Staffing & Costs (continued)

CHART 6 -- Pg. 2

Institution	Number of Staff for Facility	Cost of Staff	Number of Staff for Changing Records	Cost of Changing Records	Staff Assigned To
University of So. California	2 FTE, some students	\$14,000 annum	None	None	--
Southern Illinois University	None	None	None	No record kept.	None
Virginia Poly. State University	1 FTE, 60 hrs. student help	\$10,000 annum	--	--	User Services
Washington State University	Regular Staff	--	--	No record	Various departments
University of Washington	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	--
University of Wisconsin	1/2 FTE shelver	\$300 per month	Records not changed	Records not changed	Circulation (?)
Yale University	None (have not added vols. since 1969)	None	None	None	--
University of California, Los Angeles	ca. 14 plus 10 for warehouse.	--	n/a	n/a	Library Task Force Mgr. Circ., Del.--Res. Librn Receiving Section
Harvard University	2 FTE	--	--	--	NEDL staff reports to NEDL Board.
University of Michigan	1 1/2 FTE	--	1 FTE	\$.83 per title.	--
University of Missouri	1 librarian, 1 FTE clerk, 2 FTE students	\$35,000 annum	--	\$.05 per record	Access Services Div., Circ. Dept.
Wayne State University	5 students at 20 hrs. ea.; 1 lib. asst. FTE.	ca. \$212 per week	--	ca. \$350 per week.	(unclear) Lib. Asst./ Catalog Dept.
National Library of Canada					
Periodicals	1 temporary	n/a	1 temporary	n/a	Periodicals Section
Foreign & Internat'l Off. Pub. Sect.	2 stack persons FTE	--	None	None	--

Staffing & Costs (continued)

CHART 6 -- Pg. 3

Institution	Number of Staff for Facility	Cost of Staff	Number of Staff for Changing Records	Cost of Changing Records	Staff Assigned To
University of Chicago	Use Harper Library staff	None	--	--	Harper Library
Case Western Reserve Sears Library	None	Not applicable	"Professional librarian and/or a closely supervised library school trainee."	--	--
Freiberger Library	Responsibility of Circulation Dept.	n/a	Catalog Dept.	n/a	Circulation or Catalog Dept.
McMaster University (Mills)	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
University of Minnesota	1.5 FTE	\$17,170	n/a	n/a	Circulation Dept.
Washington University	--	--	--	--	--
University of Hawaii	Use Science-Technology staff	n/a	Done in Catalog Dept.	n/a	--
John Crerar Library	Use regular staff	None	None	None	Circulation (?)
Dartmouth (planned)	3 FTE, director & 3 student assistants	--	--	--	--
University of Western Ontario	1 FTE library assistant	\$7,500 annum	--	ca. \$.35 per vol.	--
Rice University	None	n/a	Done by serial catalogers	n/a	Reference Lib. retrieves materials on request.
University of Texas at Austin	2 FTE, 1 Asst. for 1/4 time.	\$15,515	No special staff needed.	No public records are changed.	--
University of Toronto	-1 FTE	Practically none	--	Practically none	Reference Dept. & East Asia Lib.
Princeton University	1 prof. librarian; 2 clerks; 10 hrs. student help.	--	--	\$.48 per title	Circ. Dept. 72

Institution	Number of Staff for Facility	Cost of Staff	Number of Staff for Changing Records	Cost of Changing Records	Staff Assigned To
Cornell University					
Present	No special staff required.	--	1/2 time Library Asst.	--	Catalog & Circulation Departments
Proposed	1 Library Asst. (proposed)	\$6,300	1 Library Asst.	--	Annex Library Project presently.
Boston Public	1 Librarian; 1 full-time assist.	\$9,115.00	Most records have already been changed.	Minimal	Employed by corporation controlling storage facility.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	--	--	--	n/a	Technical services.
Louisiana State University	4 Student Assistants	\$100 per week	Handled by Catalog Dept.	n/a	Photodup. Dept. oversee student assist.
Stanford University	Central Circulation Dept. personnel handle servicing and maintenance. Two new library assistant positions were added to service and maintain collection.	2 LA-I's at \$708/mo. ea. plus supervisory time and 10 hrs./wk. of student asst. time at \$2.60/hr.	n/a (No longer change records)	--	Central Circulation Dept., Green Library

3/1/78

CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPACT STORAGE COLLECTION

CHART 7 -- Pg. 1

Institution	No. of Volumes in Compact Collection	Sizes Used	Notations Used	What Records Changed?	Remarks
University of California (Berkeley & Davis)	992,606	4 sizes now, was 8	01, 02, 03, 04 call no. order	Some in charge file, others on s.l.	For Berkeley, Davis, San Fran., S. Cruz
Colorado State University	ca. 150,000	Regular and folio	HWU on printout, colored spot on vol.	None, just printout.	Ea. coll. sep.
University of Connecticut	ca. 87,000	"regular"	"Request at Circ." on CRT	---	NOT COMPACT
Emory University	--	--	--	--	Compact storage space available, but not yet used (or planned?)
Indiana University School of Medicine	19,289	Collection not sized?	Information tab in front of cat. cards.	Storage location noted on shelf list.	Elecompact system
University of Iowa	ca. 90,000	Call no. order only.	"Storage" marked on records	S.l.-"Storage, no./ yr."	Not true compact
Johns Hopkins	ca. 175,000	Call no. order only.	"Gilman Storage"	Added to public cat., serials & s.l.	--
Library of Congress	ca. 1,700,000	Call no. order only.	None special	None	Active coll.
National Library of Medicine	ca. 1,500,000	Call no. only	N.M only, Serials W1	None	Not compact.
University of North Carolina	--	--	--	--	No compact storage collection at pre- sent. Present storage is temp. pending opening of new stack wing of library.
Northwestern University	ca. 73,816	Call no. sequence	"Compact Storage"	Charged to compact storage in Circulation file.	--

76

043

75

BEST COPY

Characteristics of Compact Storage Collection (continued)

CHART 7 -- Pg. 2

Institution	No. of Volumes in Compact Collection	Sizes Used	Notations Used	What Records Changed?	Remarks
University of Pittsburgh	--	Accession no. only.	Accession no. on label.	None	Printout of stored items.
Queen's University	plan 150,000	3 sizes--but not decided	Not decided. Want to keep in call no. order.	None. Circ. printout.	--
University of So. California	180,000 vols.	0-15 cm; 15-20 cm; 20-25 cm; 25-30 cm; 30-45 cm; 45+	Size code & acc. no.	None	--
Southern Illinois University	18,650	Subj. division, author-title.	Color coded for each division	Main entry card in each division.	From Science, Ed., Soc. St. Humanities
Virginia Poly. State University	ca. 200,000	Call no. only.	"Circ. and finding system."	Circ. and finding systems.	--
Washington State University	--	low, medium, and tall	AA, A, B.+ consec. #	Serial records or s.l.	--
University of Washington	Planning	Plan 5 or 6 sizes by call number	n/a	n/a	--
University of Wisconsin	Not known	Call number and location number for uncataloged mat'ls.	--	None	Uses drawers.
Yale University	223,800	6: WA-D on foredge; WE upright; WF flat	WA, WB, WC, WD, WE, WF	All catalog records	Filled to capacity
University of California, Los Angeles	300,000	--	Accession no. & call no.: Y + size letter + accession no.	None	Like U.C. Berkeley.
Harvard University	335,000	See NEDL with MIT	KC-H, KJ, KN, KPC-KPJ, KSC-KSJ	--	--
University of Michigan	ca. 390,000	Several, but n.g.	"North Campus Storage"	Official, public & shelf list.	--

011

77

BEST COPY

78

Characteristics of Compact Storage Collection (continued)

CHART 7 -- Pg. 3

Institution	No. of Volumes in Compact Collection	Sizes Used	Notations Used	What Records Changed?	Remarks
University of Missouri	ca. 145,000	(octavo), quarto & folio	--	None, Additional record	PLANNED
Wayne State University	655,000 for both facilities	Size noted for proposed motorized shelves.	STORAGE running nos. 3722 & size. 20 cm.	OCLC files and all holding records.	--
National Library of Canada Periodicals	--	--	By range (H, J, or K) by bay (no.) & by shelf (no.)	Kardex	--
Foreign & Internat'l Off. Pub. Sect.	--	--	None	--	Most material stored in green pan boxes.
University of Chicago	90,000 compact; 65,000 call no. order.	5 sizes used, now all vols. shelved in call no. order.	Storage no. on charge record.	None; charge system at Circulation desk.	Chg. record for books in call no. order only.
Case Western Reserve Sears Library	62,403	--	Plastic overlay with "Storage Area #2"	Card catalog	--
Freiberger Library	--	--	Plastic overlay	Card catalog, circ. records, all other public records	--
McMaster University (Mills)	ca. 110,000	Same as reg. stacks.	--	Print-out	--
University of Minnesota	331,531	--	None in card cat.	None	--
Washington University	--	--	--	--	-- (Not yet developed)
University of Hawaii	--	--	Wooden dummy on shelf, also stamps.	None	Planned (Not yet developed)

045

79

80

BEST COPY

Characteristics of Compact Storage (continued)

CHART 7 -- Pg. 4

Institution	No. of Volumes in Compact Collection	Sizes Used	Notations Used	What Records Changed?	Remarks
John Crerar Library	ca. 80,000	None	None	None	Dewey 000-549 pre-1946 stored.
Dartmouth	Will be ca. 500,000	Same as Princeton.	Same as Princeton	Catalog records? Changed through OCLC as part of retrospective catalog conversion.	Planned
University of Western Ontario	ca. 160,000	Not sized.	None. Use computer-generated shelf list.	Union list of serials and cardtree.	--
Rice University	ca. 2,644	Not sized.	Pencil note on m.e. and shelf list.	Main card and shelf list.	--
University of Texas at Austin	215,556	-24 cm; -27 cm; -34.5 cm; -42 cm ("-" = to)	A, B, C, D, E, with consecutive nos. within each letter.	No public letters changed.	--
University of Toronto	4,000+ vols., and British Patents to 1970.	Not sized	None	Card cat. in East Asian Library.	--
Princeton University	123,000	6 sizes	Stickers on each vol. to identify category.	All cat. cards, including s.l.	--
Cornell University Present	125,000	6 sizes: u - up to 15 cm v - 15.1 - 20 cm w - 20.1 - 25 cm x - 25.1 - 30 cm y - 30.1 - 35 cm z - 35 cm & over	"AR" for area collection adding letter designates size, and sequentially numbered volumes; i.e. ARU, ARU 1 2	All records in general catalog. Separate s.l. maintained.	--
Planned	400,000--600,000 + 17,000 archival boxes.	5 sizes: B - up to 25 cm C - 25.1 - 30 cm D - 30.1 - 50 cm F - 50.1+ cm ARCH - Hollander Boxes.	Letter denoting size plus sequentially numbered volumes; e.g. B1, B2.	All records in general catalog. Separate s.l. maintained in Annex Library.	--

Characteristics of Compact Storage (continued)

CHART 7 -- Pg. 5

Institution	No. of Volumes in Compact Collection	Sizes Used	Notations Used	What Records Changed?	Remarks
Boston Public	10,000 newspapers 24,500 fiction 98,000 govt. docs. 12,300 serials 12,000 misc. <u>156,800</u>	None	Vols. labeled, "NEDL"	Card cat. & s.l. in central library.	--
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	--	None	"NEDL typed after classification no.	All catalog records by erasing previous notations & typing "NEDL"	--
Louisiana State University	103,290	None at present	location symbol, "Hill"	Card cat., serials cat., and rotating periodical file.	--
Stanford University	250,000	All vols. stored in call no. order.	Dead serials have plastic slipcovers on m.e. & s.l. with wooden blocks in original stack location referring patron to Circulation Desk.	None	--

3/1/78

047

83

84

BEST COPY

GENERAL INFORMATION AND DESCRIPTIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

Page

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	2
THE PRESENT SITUATION	4
Definition	4
Prevalence	4
Location of Stored Collections	5
Arrangement of Stored Materials	5
Records	6
Service Patterns	6
Size of Storage Collections	6
Use Patterns	7
Staffing and Costs	7
Selection Criteria	7
PLANNING FOR STORAGE	
The Setting	8
Physical Location	10
Physical Facilities	11
Arrangement of Stored Materials	11
Means of Displaying Storage Status	12
Selection of Material for Storage	12
Service Patterns	13
ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS	14
Relations with Faculty Members	14
Relations with the Administration	15
THE FUTURE ALTERNATIVES TO STORAGE	16
CONCLUSION	17

BOOK STORAGE IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

A report submitted to
The Council on Library Resources

by

George Piteraick
School of Librarianship
The University of British Columbia

Vancouver, Canada

1974

INTRODUCTION

This survey* of the present state of book storage in large North American academic libraries was undertaken in order to provide some general answers to a number of broad questions. The subject of book storage has been treated in a number of writings, largely dealing either with theoretical aspects of achieving maximal compactness and economy in storage or with details of specific storage practices. There is, however, a paucity of literature dealing with the actual situation today, especially as regards these broad questions:

- How prevalent is storage today, specifically, the storage of regularly-catalogued books and serials?
- What types of physical accommodation are used for storage?
- What types of storage records are considered necessary?
- What principles govern the selection of material for storage?
- To what extent do user needs, either demonstrated or assumed, influence storage arrangements?
- How is storage approached; i.e., as an ad hoc adaptation to a temporary problem or as a planned development of a rational arrangement of resources?
- How does storage affect other library operations and relations with students, faculty, and administration?
- What alternatives to storage are envisioned or used?

Answers to these general questions seemed best obtained by visits to libraries engaged in storage and interviews with librarians involved in storage operations. Accordingly, letters were sent to every ARL academic library in which the fact of their engagement in book storage was solicited as well as their willingness to receive the surveyor and answer his questions. From the list of libraries answering affirmatively in both cases, a sample of libraries to visit was selected. The sampling was haphazard rather than random. Considerations of scheduling, geography, and other factors resulted in visits made to fifteen libraries, representing a significant diversity in size, age, type of support, location, and storage patterns. These libraries were those of the University of California (Berkeley), University of Chicago, University of Connecticut, Cornell University, Harvard University, University of Kansas, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, Princeton University, Purdue University, Rice University, University of Texas, Tulane University, Wayne State University, and Yale University. The visits were made during the months of April and May, 1973. An attempt was made to interview, in a very loosely-structured manner, the director of the library and other librarians involved in the planning or operation of storage facilities. No special attempt was made to talk with other persons directly or indirectly

* The author is grateful for the award of a Council on Library Resources Fellowship for 1972/73, during which this survey was made.

concerned, such as students, faculty members, or administrative officers, although opportunities presented themselves on occasion, and were seized.

It is clearly inappropriate, in a general survey of this type, to identify specific ideas, attitudes, or procedures with specific institutions or persons, and such identification will be avoided unless they add something useful, or unless their avoidance obscures understanding. Indeed, it is difficult at this stage to attribute accurately hundreds of informal statements made by 60 or 70 people with any degree of confidence. With almost no exception the librarians interviewed were candid, forthcoming, hospitable, and indulgent. I thank them all.

Similarly, in discussing specific details of procedures no estimation of their relative frequency of use or acceptance can be given. As earlier stated, the sample of storing libraries was not a random sample. This report is to be read only as one person's impressions of contemporary storage practices and theories, and his reactions thereto.

BACKGROUND

That spectacular increases in the rate of book and serial acquisition by large academic libraries have taken place during the last decades is a statement requiring little quantitative confirmation, except by way of an indication of magnitudes. Thirty-seven major North American academic libraries, for which records are available for the entire period, and all now members of ARL, added 12.6 million volumes to their aggregate holdings between 1940 and 1950, 17.0 million volumes in the next decade, and 31.3 million volumes between 1960 and 1970. This last figure is larger than the aggregate of reported holdings of these libraries in 1940, or, put another way, these 37 libraries added, in the decade of the sixties, more volumes than they had accumulated during their entire existence up to 1940! It should be pointed out that among these 37 libraries are the 25 largest academic libraries in North America, whose growth rates, on the whole, have been less spectacular than those of younger and smaller institutions.

This phenomenal growth has taken place, moreover, during a period in which other developments have taken place which should, theoretically, have had a depressing effect on the acquisition of books and serials. Microforms have become a major category of acquisition; during fiscal 1969/70 and 1970/71 ARL libraries added 18.8 million volumes and 14.6 million microform units. At the same time there have been significant increases in the number of new and improved bibliographical instruments for the location of library materials for interlibrary borrowing in lieu of acquisition. Sharing plans of one kind or another have also continued to proliferate during this period.

The austerity of the seventies will undoubtedly reduce the acceleration of library acquisition rates, but the rates themselves will likely continue at impressive levels. Net additions to ARL academic libraries have dropped in 1970/71 and 1971/72 from the high point reached

in fiscal 1969/70, but only slightly*.

The physical capacities of libraries and library systems have, mercifully, shown large increases also. Most academic libraries, during the last two affluent decades, have increased their volume capacity by erection of new main library buildings, main library additions, stack extensions, new undergraduate libraries, and new or expanded branch libraries or departmental reading rooms in non-library buildings. Some few have built special storage libraries or occupied existing buildings for book storage purposes.

In general, growth of the library physical plant has been only palliative; few libraries are designed to accommodate increases of the order of 100,000-150,000 volumes per year for very long. And there are clear signs that university capital expenditures for library buildings will drop sharply in the next few years, if only as a reflection of general university financial cutbacks.

University librarians have long felt the responsibility of acquiring all the library materials necessary to support the teaching and research objectives of their institutions (broadly interpreted), and have worked toward that ideal, constrained only by the realities of available funds and manpower. At the same time it has long been realized that not all the books, serials, and other materials in an academic library get anywhere near the same amount of use. Not a few librarians have realized that substantial portions of their collections get, practically speaking, no use at all. The idea that little-used books and serials might be removed from the main shelving sequence of a library and stored in some condition of secondary accessibility was made in print as long ago as 1893, and by 1903 a well-developed proposal for a cooperative storage library for the Harvard College library and some other Massachusetts institutions was put forward by the librarian of Harvard². This plan was brought to fruition with the formation of the New England Deposit Library in 1941. Many other storage facilities, both cooperative and individual, have been put into operation since that date. It is probably correct to say that the storage response to library growth problems has been in the main a large-library response - smaller libraries have been more likely to enlarge their buildings or erect new ones. It is also probably true to say that book storage has not been adopted with any great enthusiasm anywhere. The reasons for this lack of enthusiasm are various, and include practical, psychological, and administrative aspects - all of considerable influence. They will be discussed later.

*Aggregate net additions: 1968/69 - 7.2 million volumes; 1969/70 7.5 million volumes; 1970/71 - 7.4 million volumes; 1971/72 - 7.1 million volumes; and 1972/73 - 7.1 million volumes. (From ARL Academic Library Statistics 1968/69 - 1972/73. Totals for 1970/71 to 1972/73 corrected to exclude Rice and Howard Universities, not represented in the 1968/69 - 1969/70 totals.)

²Lane, William C. "The Treatment of Books According to the Amount of their Use." Library Journal 28 (July, 1903) p.9.

THE PRESENT SITUATION

Definition

The word "storage", in its library context, is susceptible to various interpretations. Here used it signifies any removal of conventionally-catalogued or processed units from their normal location in the stack sequence to a location in which accessibility for consultation or borrowing is reduced in the interests of increasing stack space.

So defined, storage does not include any treatment of unprocessed or partially processed materials such as large gift collections, bulk purchases, or cataloguing arrearages. Removal of units to locations such as reference areas, reserve book rooms, branch libraries, etc., obviously does not qualify as storage by virtue of the generally enhanced availability for consultation in such areas. The term "book" will here be used to refer to stored materials in general unless the distinction between monograph and serial is explicit and necessary.

Prevalence

The initial query to ARL academic libraries in March 1973 revealed that thirty-five were storing significant portions of their holdings at that time. Another thirteen had not yet reached the point of having to store books, but stated that the need was imminent. Twenty-five libraries had no immediate space problems necessitating storage treatment, and no response was obtained from three libraries.

Among those libraries which were not yet storing books but recognized that the need for so doing was not long in the future, the large majority reported that storage would be necessary within the next two, three, or five years. Several reported that storage was not yet upon them only because completion and occupation of new library units in the recent past had allowed them, by way of shifting their collections, to avert the inevitable for a few years more.

The twenty-five libraries which reported no present or immediately foreseeable storage problems usually gave no further details. One, however, interestingly enough, confessed to an embarrassment of riches, having so much space for books that tenant enclaves had been encouraged within the library, and division of the book collection into regular and over-size categories had not yet proven necessary. Such situations appear to be rare. Among the three libraries which did not respond to the initial query, at least one is known to store books.

Storage, therefore, appears to be a common necessity among ARL academic libraries, with, practically speaking, two out of every three libraries either storing books or faced with that necessity within a short time.

Location of Stored Collections

Books and serial volumes removed from their normal position in the stacks of the main library or any other library unit, are stored in a variety of locations. Four of the libraries visited had the use of separate library buildings erected primarily or entirely for storage purposes. These buildings were always in a peripheral location - off-campus, on a satellite campus, or at the edge of the main campus. Other libraries use separate structures such as warehouses adapted for library storage purposes. These also are in peripheral locations. The remaining libraries use some type of on-campus location; an outgrown main library building, the basement or attic of a main or branch library in current use, or some part of another campus building, usually a basement or attic.

The physical quarters themselves and their furnishings exhibit a very wide variety. The separate storage library may be anything from a bare, dilapidated hut originally built for some other (usually humble) function, entirely without climatic control of any sort, to an elegant, air-conditioned building specifically designed for library storage. The bookstack may be anything from hastily constructed wooden shelving, or rickety ancient wooden stacks to modern, flexible, well-engineered, industrial shelving. Lighting ranges from portable flashlight or drop cord to fluorescent tubing, arranged to provide a high level of illumination.

Arrangement of Stored Materials

The economic desirability of shelving stored materials as compactly as possible was recognized at the start, and the early storage libraries emphasized arrangements which increased the density of volumes per unit of space significantly beyond that found in a conventional book stack. In the main this was accomplished by placing books in one of a half-dozen or so size categories and shelving sequentially within these categories, thereby achieving greater compactness by using the largest number of shelves per section allowable, and by having all the used shelves full at all times. Additional compactness was realized in some cases by shelving some sizes of books on their fore-edger.

This kind of arrangement persists today, but several libraries which have arranged stored books in this manner no longer do so, or plan other arrangements in any future storage activities. The reasons for these departures will be discussed later. Other libraries were found to retain the division into size groupings, but to shelve by subject classification within these groupings. Still others retain the original classified bookstack arrangement for stored materials, but in a storage location. Within this type of arrangement variation exists also. In some cases, where abundance of shelf space exists within the storage facility, shelving is very "loose"; it is hoped that addition of books to be stored in the future can be accommodated with only minimal shifting, ultimately to produce a filled stack. In other cases, characteristic of storage libraries where books are sent to storage more or less sporadically, in large groups, several class number sequences may occur in a single storage library.

Records

The problem of altering records in order to show that catalogued materials are in a storage location is attacked in a number of ways. They range in extremes, from indicating storage status and storage call number on every relevant card in the public catalogue to simply treating the storage facility as another borrower in the circulation record. Between these two extremes are found a variety of procedures offering some intermediate degree of ease and rapidity with which the borrower may learn of the location of material he wants or needs. In some cases where automated circulation procedures are used, a print-out of books charged to storage is updated at intervals and kept in a public location. In other cases, a special manual shelf list of stored books is made available at such locations. In one library where serial runs constitute the major category of stored material, a "Linedex" visible file of serials in storage is provided. It is clear that many libraries are unable or unwilling to include large-scale record alteration in their storage procedures for reasons which will be discussed in a later section.

Service Patterns

Typically, desired materials are retrieved from the storage facility either immediately upon demand, or according to some advertised schedule. Without exception immediate retrieval is practiced by those libraries which store materials within or closely adjacent to the main library. Where there is some considerable distance between the storage facility and the central library pickups from storage are found to be made twice daily, once daily, or (in one case) twice weekly.

Nominally at least, all storage collections are closed-stack collections. However, where user needs involve the transport of materials of considerable bulk, or a search through lengthy files, arrangements are made whereby the user is permitted to go to the storage library or is taken there. In many of the libraries a small number of tables, chairs, etc. is provided for such activities, and, in some cases, transportation is supplied by the library.

Size of Storage Collections

Storage collections ranged in size from approximately 30,000 volumes to 500,000 volumes in the libraries visited. Three are growing rapidly, with annual additions of 47,000 volumes, 35,000 volumes, and 30,000 volumes respectively; at least five are not now actively adding to their storage collections. In two cases storage has been suspended because the storage library itself was full; in other cases storage had been suspended pending remodeling of space or re-examination of storage objectives and processes.

Use Patterns

Few libraries keep very close records of the amount of circulation of stored books, and those figures available are not readily comparable. The few records available appear to support the impression that stored books are relatively little-used. That is to say, no case was found where the number of circulations per year from a storage facility exceeded 5% of the number of volumes held there; and the circulation from most was considerably below this figure. Comparable circulation figures for main libraries are in the range of 40%-100%, although circulation figures among libraries which differ in loan policies are not easily comparable.

There is some indication that circulation from a storage facility increases at more than a linear rate as the facility grows in number of volumes held. This should be expected; as the percentage of the total book stock which is in storage grows proportionally, more and more of the stored books would be asked for.

Staffing and Costs

The number of persons engaged in storage operations varies considerably from library to library, dependent, in large measure, upon the level of storage activity. Some libraries are simply maintaining storage collections, and tasks associated with storage are confined in large part to merely paging the occasional book from a locked storehouse and returning it after use. At the other extreme are found libraries actively selecting material for storage, altering records for material so stored, maintaining staff at the storage facility, and carrying on a relatively brisk circulation activity. In any case, library activities associated with storage are frequently subsumed under other library activities, and isolation of specific storage activities from a general responsibility is difficult, and usually not done.

The major direct costs associated with book storage are undoubtedly those of selection and record alteration. These costs, of course, would vary greatly with the specific procedures adopted in each case. Very few figures were found in this survey concerning these costs. Those found indicate that selection costs can be as high as \$2.00 per volume selected, and record-changing costs can be as high as \$1.00 and possibly more. Storage is not an inexpensive process.

Selection Criteria

There is general agreement that materials stored should be those of lowest potential future use and greatest physical bulk. The prediction of future use, like all prediction, is subject to some degree of error; there is no infallible method of predicting use. The most feasible indicator of future use appears to be past use, and all libraries utilize this parameter to some extent at least. Typically it is used either alone, or in combination with other factors such as date of publication, date of acquisition, or language. The ease with which past use can be ascertained varies with the type of circulation system in use; i.e., the presence or absence of a

date-due slip or some similar instrument. As the number of libraries using automated circulation procedures increases it is to be expected that records generated as a by-product will become more frequently used in establishing the circulation history of stack books.

In certain cases, volume-by-volume examination to ascertain past use is obviated by some type of "block" storage, where whole categories are sent to storage. The blocks used are determined on one or more of a number of bases - age, language of publication, subject, or format, used either singly or in combination. Examples are: serial backfiles (typically in science and technology) beyond a given date; books published in certain recondite languages; books in subject categories in which the university has no current teaching or research interest; university calendars, etc.

The procedural advantages of block storage lie in their avoidance of book-by-book examination and record alteration and the relative ease with which storage status can be advertised.

PLANNING FOR STORAGE

The Setting

It is perhaps not too unfair to characterise the present status of book storage in larger academic libraries on the whole as representing a group of pragmatic responses to ad hoc situations, rather than planned responses to an emerging reality. This reality is that campus libraries can no longer expect to grow infinitely in stock and services without more recognition of the fact that there is wide variation in the extent of use to which their holdings are put, and that it is no longer realistic to hope to provide the same degree of accessibility to every item in their ever-growing stocks. Not always, but typically, some degree of rough separation of materials into classes of more used and less used, by means of storage, is viewed and entered upon as some sort of temporary expedient, and hence more or less unwillingly.

There are reasons for this unwillingness, and many are strong and compelling. They include considerations which are profound and basic to the whole role of academic libraries.

First, large-scale book storage is always detrimental to the level of service aspired to by university libraries. Storage of materials inevitably impedes ready access for selection, consultation, or borrowing to some extent. Most library users will be hampered at one time or another; some will be hampered frequently. Impairment of service involves not only the delay created by shelving in a secondary location from which books can be retrieved on a deferred basis only, but also the loss, to the library user, of all those capabilities conveyed by the term "browsable". He loses the ability to examine the book as to its

suitability for his purposes on the spot; he also loses the opportunity of finding useful material more or less by accident. Moreover, the users most disobliged by storage are likely to be those who use the library to its great extent - the teaching faculty and research staff. This is, unfortunately, also the group upon whose favour the library depends in large measure for its influence and support.

Second, the economic advantages of storing books and other library materials are not always clearly demonstrable, or of commanding magnitudes. The acts of selecting materials for storage, changing the library's records of such material, building or preparing and maintaining a storage facility, transferring the books to storage, and giving service from the storage facility are all variable costs; in toto they appear in most cases to be not dramatically smaller than the costs of conventional housing for library materials, as Ellsworth^{*} shows.

Some unwillingness to enter upon large-scale storage is attributable to a feeling that the conditions which point to storage as a necessity in the present or near future may be only transient. Such hopes are of two general types; local and universal. The library faced with stack overcrowding to an extent intolerable now or deemed to become so in two or three years may have hope, perhaps reasonable hope, that funds for a new main library building, or any large library building, will be granted this year or next, bringing relief for another decade at least. These hopes need not be vain; the Harvard College Library found erection of the New England Storage Library the only practical way out of its crowding problems in 1941. Now, upon completion of the Pusey Library around 1975 it anticipates no major stack-crowding problems for the next 12-13 years.

Another set of hopes relates to future developments in librarianship and related technologies. Significant reduction in the bulk of library acquisitions, it is agreed, will be brought about by such means as miniaturization of the materials themselves, transmission of text by electronic means, or by improvements in such embryonic procedures as cooperative storage and inter-library communication networks fostering cooperative acquisition and use of library materials.

Faced with the problem of finding additional space within the library complex to house a rapidly-growing collection the librarian must obviously react by seeking to expand existing library units or add new ones. But he rarely needs only stack space; service demands also continue to proliferate, and the need for increased space to house books and periodicals is normally only a part of a general need for more library space. However, when new or expanded library units are out of the question, or when book storage space is required without the necessity for a concomitant increase in service space, the provision of added book space alone becomes the only practical alternative. It is extremely doubtful that any storage library was ever built or any space occupied for the purpose of book storage, where there was the possibility of constructing a new library unit or enlarging an existing one.

^{*}Ellsworth, Ralph E. The Economics of Books Storage in College and University Libraries. Washington, Association of Research Libraries, 1969.

The creation of a storage facility, made necessary under these conditions, is hence an operation entered into with no great enthusiasm; nonetheless, the need exists for decision making on a great number of questions. It is apparent that the primary constraint, i.e., the necessity for creating a storage facility rather than building a new library or expanding one already in existence, is only the first of a number of constraints which limit the librarian in bringing the storage facility into operation. Decisions must be made on the following major points:

- location
- physical facilities and equipment
- arrangement of stored materials
- means of record alteration to display storage status
- selection of materials to be stored
- service patterns

Reliable data upon which to base his decisions are rare, hard to find, and not always applicable. He operates under many constraints outside his control and in any case must balance economy against service desiderata, always in the light of administrative and political considerations. No doubt all this accounts for the wide variety of storage patterns now in existence. It is obvious also that the areas of decision are by no means independent, and that decisions in one area will color or even determine which decisions are made in another.

Physical Location

Choice of location is involved in most cases only when a new building is to be erected for book storage. The site chosen is inevitably peripheral; the only consideration which makes a case for erecting a storage facility close to the central library is that of convenience of access. This factor must and should be considered relatively unimportant in contrast to such realities as the value of central campus land and the desirability of such land for uses involving the large numbers of people on the central campus. The actual distance of the storage facility from the central library, and whether the location is at the edge of campus or off-campus are matters which are probably not too important and about which the librarians will probably not have very much to say in any case. The actual number of miles between storage facility and main library, if kept relatively small (less than 10 miles) is probably trivial in terms of turn-around time once truck transport becomes necessary.

When existing space can be utilized for book storage in lieu of building a storage structure there is probably no choice involved. Any university administration will be strongly moved to utilize any untenanted space, even if remotely sited and poorly suited for book storage. It is hard to marshal convincing arguments against such usage.

Physical Facilities

Choice on type of shelving to be purchased or constructed is intimately related to choice of shelving arrangement to be used for the materials and choice of method of displaying storage status. As mentioned, the earlier storage libraries were designed to maximize compactness in storage, achieved for the most part by establishment of size categories in which the books were arranged consecutively by time of arrival in the storage facility and hence entirely irrespective of subject classification. For this type of arrangement, fixed shelving and narrow aisles suffice. If subject arrangement is desired, whether conventional or within selected size categories, a greater capacity for adjustment is necessary. There appears to be a trade-off in cost between extreme compactness of storage and the equipment necessary to achieve it. Unless space is extremely short, the use of such devices as rolling shelving, the RandRiever, etc., are probably not economical alternatives, their first costs being extremely high. Their use is probably more effective in order to augment book capacity in an active collection; the use of such expensive devices to house a collection of books selected on the basis of little or no use seems highly questionable.

Arrangement of Stored Materials

In selecting a method for arranging books in a storage collection the librarians is engaged in balancing, all other things being equal, compactness, procedural economy, and user ease. To shelve books serially within a group of size categories maximizes compactness. Books are packed tightly in shelves, shelves are close together in a section, the shelves are filled completely. No stack shifting is ever necessary. Required, however, is the generation of a new book number for every book, and the application of this new book number, in some way, to each book and to some, at least, of the records for each book. It must be borne in mind also, that another "reclassification" will be necessary if books are returned from storage to general housing. Additionally, creation of such a sequence destroys browsability entirely. To maintain the original subject classification unchanged in the storage facility is extravagant in space requirements and necessitates stack shifts at certain times. The amount of record changing required, however, is minimal, and browsability is unimpaired, except for the factor of distance from the library's center.

These are the extreme cases. Intermediate methods can be and are used. The practice, for instance, of shelving by class number within size categories achieves an intermediate degree of compactness while retaining some degree of browsability. The problem of record alteration is also intermediate in magnitude.

It is clear that choice of arrangement is no simple matter; it is likely that decision will be inspired or forced by the nature of the storage space available, and the availability of staff for reclassification and record alteration.

Means of Displaying Storage Status

Whether the librarian goes to the extreme of indicating on every catalogue card that the item listed is in storage (along with its new storage number) or goes to the other extreme of indicating this fact only on a single internal record, unavailable to his borrowers, rests on a number of considerations. The first alternative is extremely demanding of labor; the second considerably less so. Preparation of a special storage shelf-list made up of xero-graphed copies of pre-existing cards is relatively inexpensive.

The decision here is based primarily on what the librarian is willing to spend in order to make information on the availability of storage books readily accessible. Those who favor the expensive alternative argue that no library user should be put to any greater pains than necessary in order to secure a copy of a stored book. Once a book is stored the potential user is already penalized by the fact that he cannot immediately secure and consult a book in its normal stack location, or, indeed, happen upon the book accidentally while looking for material within a subject area. To penalize him further by requiring him to consult special files (of whose existence he may be unaware) or library staff to ascertain that the book is in storage and available within hours or days is manifestly unfair. But these arguments can be countered. Books are stored because they have little theoretical potential for future use, and stored books are in fact used much less frequently than unstored books in all installations. It may be that the usage rate is depressed because they are less accessible, but it may also be true that some of the recorded borrowing of stored books would not have occurred if the book had been immediately available for inspection and rejection. In any event, the probability of a user finding that a book he wants is in storage is probably much lower than the probability of its being already charged out to another borrower. And no librarian would think seriously of recording circulation in a library catalogue.

It is unfortunate that so many large academic libraries indicate location of books outside the main stack collection by rubber-stamping or typing locations on the catalogue cards presenting those books. Useful as this practice might once have been when university libraries were strongly centralized and branch or divisional libraries small and infrequent, it is singularly uneconomic and inefficient in these days, when half or more of the library's holdings may be in peripheral location. Those libraries which have adopted the use of "location files", i.e., shelf-lists showing locations of titles on a tick-off list, are in a much better position to cope efficiently with storage listing. Their users are already trained to go from the main, added, or subject entry to the location card, and the storage location need be only another location.

Selection of Material for Storage

There seems to be no disagreement that previous use is the best indicator of future use; and that in-library use is reflected possibly by

recorded circulation, the general validity of these propositions is attested to some extent by the relatively low use of stored books wherever storage is practiced. For monographs this practice involves title-by-title examination of books. Such examination is rapidly accomplished where records of past use are present within the books themselves; absence of such data requires recourse to less definite data which are, however, not entirely hidden from the practised eye. Decision on such bases as wear-and-tear, however, is much less definite and efficient. The use of an historical borrowing record generated in the course of automated circulation procedures will be increasingly useful in this connection. Backfiles of serials, especially scientific and technological series, are also prime candidates for storage; selection here also may be done with speed and efficiency.

Storage en bloc of publications considered eligible because they are in subject areas outside the university community's academic interests must be done cautiously. It is very difficult for the librarian to keep up with all the research and avocational interests of the entire academic community, and academic interests, becoming increasingly interdisciplinary, create unexpected demands.

Selection of books for storage may be done continuously or in discrete stages as need arises. The latter practice is the one most frequently encountered. No data have been encountered which would point to any particular advantage of one method over the other.

It must be constantly borne in mind that selection of materials for storage cannot be perfect. Mistakes will be made; the future will be imperfectly predicted. The university librarian who decided to store almost the whole lot of his library's large holdings in Eastern religion, mysticism, yoga, tarot, etc., in 1945 cannot fairly be faulted if these collections are in heavy demand today. What is important is that the mechanism by which materials can move between conventional and storage housing be made as flexible and inexpensive as possible.

Service Patterns

Service from a storage library is of two kinds: retrieval of books requested and provision of facilities whereby library users may examine items at the facility itself. Retrieval is done usually but not invariably as a scheduled service, the actual schedule established through some part of balancing of distance, amount of use, and a subjective evaluation of what constitutes a tolerable time for library users to wait for their books. Where the storage facility is very close to the central library paging of stored books may be considered on a demand basis, and done at once. Whatever added expense is involved in so doing may well be compensated for an increased fund of good will toward the library.

For certain materials and for certain uses it is clearly inefficient to bring the materials from storage to the user. For looking through a series of volumes of a periodical or newspaper or other bulky material in search of an article for which the citation in hand may be corrupt, for

searching through the shelves for material when the books are arranged in subject groupings, etc., it is clearly more economic to bring the reader to the books. This necessity is taken care of by the provision of a small number of reading stations at the facility. Providing them, however, may well involve also the provision of adequate lighting, climatic control, and some staffing. Nevertheless, whatever the cost, it would seem to be a wise expenditure to make these amenities available.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS

Book storage is in the main unattractive to all concerned - librarian and library user alike. The reasons for the distaste with which it is viewed are both practical and psychological; it is difficult to say which is stronger. In any event, storage is typically approached in a largely negative spirit, as an undesirable necessity at best, an unreasonable imposition at worst. Rarely is it viewed as a natural and perhaps inevitable result of tremendous increase in the rate of publication and the number of users and consumers of these publications both working to increase the rate of library acquisitions; together with the reality of a marked obsolescence of many publications and, perhaps, an increase in the rate of this obsolescence. The librarian forced to store books is in the position of a salesman who doesn't believe in his product very much and who is trying to sell it to a buyer who is either indifferent or hostile.

Relations with Faculty Members

That portion of the university library clientele for whom research constitutes a major activity constitutes the group most likely to have need of the types of materials most usually found in a storage library. Of this group, faculty members constitute the most important constituent; important not only for the work they do, but for the effect of their relationships with the library. Not only is the library usually governed formally by a predominantly faculty committee, but individual faculty members, in their teaching and research activities, determine the library's acquisition and service policies to a large extent. Any strong dissatisfaction they may feel with the library's holdings and operations is rarely silent for very long.

It is probably fair to say that faculty members generally take a dim view of storage, at least as an initial reaction. Their dislike of the whole process can be focussed on two points: they feel that storage causes delay in obtaining books definitely wanted and that storage impedes or destroys the capability for subject searching and browsing. The validity of these objections is not easily demonstrable. True, a book in storage does normally take longer than a book in the stack to get into the reader's hands, but this is true only if the book is resting on the shelves in both cases. But few books in storage are actually asked for (that is why they

are storage) - it seems more likely that a reader's chances of finding that a particular book he wants is in storage are much lower than his chances of finding that it is on loan to another borrower. The fact that relevant and important documents are sometimes discovered by browsing cannot be denied. It is not clear, however, how frequent such discoveries are or to what extent they could have been made more readily had the library's bibliographical apparatus been more assiduously and knowledgeably used. After all, it is undeniable that an impressive amount of distinguished research has been done in the New York Public Library and in the great libraries of Europe, where browsing is entirely unknown and impossible. The argument that weeding a library collection might increase its usefulness has been made, but is not likely to convince scholars. But such questions cannot profitably be discussed here - the fact remains that storage of library holdings is not generally favored by faculty members.

How should the librarian minimize this discontent? No formula, alas, is available. Two lines of approach suggest themselves. The first and obvious one is to minimize the effects of storage both by making delays as small as possible and by retaining some degree of subject arrangement in the storage facility, adding some provision for library users to work there or at least feel that they can work there if they want to. A paging schedule which is both reasonable and flexible would seem a good investment in faculty relations. In one library, the offer of free, on-demand transportation for faculty members to the outlying storage library was enthusiastically received and relatively little used. Another possible line of approach is that of playing down the very fact of storage. It is unlikely that it can ever be kept a secret, but it is usually easier to defend a fait accompli than to sell an unpopular program. A low profile and a capacity to deliver stored materials readily may obviate the whole problem. It may be that mere avoidance of the word "storage", especially in the designation of the facility, would be a useful strategy. At least one library has changed the name of its storage facility from one using that word to one embodying the name of a posthumous donor.

To minimize faculty discontent by involving them actively in some phase of the operation is also a possible strategy. Several libraries have attempted to use faculty members in the work of selecting materials for storage. Such attempts have not been outstandingly successful. The intrinsic value and historical importance of a book are not necessarily reflected in the demand for its use.

Relations with the Administration

The library of a major university is a significant consumer of university funds, both capital and operational. University library budgets have shown spectacular growth during the last two decades, and although this growth is at a rate not significantly different from that of the total university budgets themselves, the absolute costs are impressive. The fact that library costs are lumped into a single item in most budgets makes their magnitude especially apparent, and hence vulnerable.

vulnerable.

The need for a storage library has at least two major implications for other library budgeting: its possible effects on library acquisitions and its possible effect on the library building program. The high rate and large cost of library book and serial acquisitions have been questioned at many universities, e.g., at the University of California; the charge has been made that money is "wasted" on arcane publications of little practical use. The argument for a storage library, containing as it must the statement that some of the library's holdings get very little use or only rare use, could seem to add weight to this charge. No actual occurrences of this argument have been encountered, but the possibility exists and is feared.

The effect of building a storage library on other segments of the library's building program deserves mention also. Given a finite amount of funds upon which to draw in an environment in which there is always great competition for capital funds, it would seem to follow that establishment of a storage library would have the effect of delaying or deferring other library construction. Moreover, pressures for additional book space are alleviated by the use of a storage facility; arguments for the construction of other libraries would be weakened thereby even when additional book space is only one part of the argument. Many librarians feel that these effects are real and potentially dangerous, but the extent to which they are operative in any university will vary widely. Indeed, one librarian interviewed thought that his operation of a storage library actually aided his building program by dramatizing the library's dire need for additional space.

THE FUTURE - ALTERNATIVES TO STORAGE

Any practical alternatives to storage as a solution to the problems of a library whose collections are growing faster than its capacity to shelve them conventionally remain as alternatives which are not significant at the present time. If the librarian cannot build more libraries or expand existing libraries under his control in order to house his collections, he has no practical alternative at present but to store some of his books outside his libraries, either in existing buildings or in new ones.

But what of the future? Two classes of alternatives may in the future offer relief; in essence they involve either the conversion of library holdings into a less bulky form or the rationalization of library operations in such a way as to reduce individual library collection building by group acquisition, group storage, and intensified cooperative interlibrary services. None of these ideas are particularly novel, and many examples of all of these practices can be found. But they do not, at present, fill the bill and many thorny problems, technological, jurisdictional, legal, financial and psychological remain to be solved before they can be really successful. Solution is not to be expected immediately; book storage will be with us for a long time to come.

CONCLUSION

No set of do's and don'ts can be issued to the university librarian faced with storage. Nothing is more pervasive than the reality that university libraries are remarkably diverse in plant operations, financial resources, history, traditions, and philosophies, or the reality that the librarian's choice of storage style is severely constrained by all these factors.

But the questions "which is best?", "what should I do?" have been asked and will continue to be asked. Imagining a situation where freedom of choice exists, where no constraints upon decision-making are involved, this investigator, on the basis of what he has seen and heard, would view, as optimal, a storage operation with the following characteristics:

1. A specially construction storage building of utmost simplicity, built on comparatively inexpensive land not too far (≤ 5 miles) from the main library, on an unchoked travel path. The building, except for suitable working areas and a small, well furnished area for readers (10-15 stations), to be as open and as free as possible of columns and other obstructions.
2. Industrial shelving of good quality and having a limited capacity for variable shelf height would be used. Books and other library materials would be shelved in subject classification order within four or five size categories. Shelving would be "loose", with a view toward making large-scale stack shifts only rarely necessary.
3. Storage status would be indicated in the main library by an appropriate tick on a location file shelflist card. The storage library itself would be known as the Fussler Library, the Ellsworth Library, or if a donor is involved, by his name. When the books are sent to storage from a branch or division library a special storage shelflist for that branch should be started. The maintenance of a catalogue at the storage facility itself would be averted if at all possible.
4. Materials would be selected for storage on the basis of recorded use. A simple criterion such as ten years since acquisition or last loan would be used. For serials, back files would be stored in 5 year groups. All groups in which no use had been recorded in any volume over a 10-year period would be stored. Faculty members would be involved in no stage of the selection process; however, any book specifically requested or borrowed from the storage library would be resh-lved in the central library upon its return and remain there for another decade. Any book a borrower claims that he uses frequently in the stacks, but does not check out, would be returned also, with no challenge.
5. No library user would wait more than 24 hours for a book requested from storage. If possible, all requests placed during one day would be available at 9:00 a.m. the following day, with special delivery available upon request.

THE 1975-76 ANNUAL REPORT OF THIS FACILITY IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST FROM SPEC
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY. General Library. Storage Facility.

SCOPE and FUNCTION

The University's northern Library Storage Facility — formally, The Intercampus Library Facility (North) — is located ten miles from the central campus in part of a reconditioned World War II factory at Richmond. It is intended to serve the storage needs of the Libraries at Berkeley, San Francisco, Davis and Santa Cruz and now contains collections of the first three campuses. Provision is for two kinds of storage — of books and other units available for ordinary circulation and paged by call number or shelf number, and of inaccessible collections of arrearages stored as groups and accessible only to staff of the administrative unit storing the arrearage. The present range of stored materials includes all physical forms except sheet maps and sheet music, slides, microcards and microfiches.

The stored collections now number about 1,000,000 units. (There are no statistical counts of the stored Bancroft Library collections, which are shelved in a special area accessible only to Bancroft staff.) At present, about 800,000 units consist of cataloged volumes and brief-listed volumes and individual pamphlets. Other units are counted by container and circulate only as full numbered containers.

History. Originally, the Facility was planned to accomodate only little-used materials. This policy guided selection from 1964/65 to 1967/68. Since then, lack of campus provision for continuing collection growth and a more general constriction of library space of all kinds has had two effects: the selection criterion of low use has become progressively less effective, and the rate of increase in storing has risen sharply for non-book units and arrearages of several kinds -- for example, of boxed Bancroft Library manuscripts, of Music Library phonorecords, of Newspaper Room bundles of wrapped newspapers not yet filmed.

Planning. University planning about regional cooperation and systems development is expected to affect the storage operation and some preliminary Library surveys have been in progress and continue. Specific new planning for storage remains informal.

ADMINISTRATION

The storage operation is now centralized through the position of one of the two Assistant University Librarians, who is also formal Head of the Storage Facility. Book shifts are scheduled through the Library Business Officer, to whom the Mail Room (which handles daily circulation) reports. Selection of new storage is now decentralized as an ordinary function of collection development officers, who are mainly heads of branches and service units or subject specialists in various Main Building departments.

History. Prior to 1970, the Associate University Librarian authorized storage, one Assistant University Librarian directed and coordinated selection, the Head of Main Building Circulation Department directed the creation of needed storage records and provided circulation functions for the campus, and the Business Officer headed the Facility and directed other storage functions.

Planning. Main Building selection functions were transferred from the Assistant University Librarian to collection development officers last summer. When active storage resumes next summer, the newly created position of Assistant University Librarian for Collection Development and Reference Services is expected to coordinate presently decentralized selection.

STORAGE FACILITY - CAPACITY AND STAFFING

The Facility is now equipped with shelving to about two-fifths of capacity. The first augmentation in shelving, expected to be available by late summer will increase capacity to a little more than one-half. During the past year, permanent staffing at the Facility was increased and established at the level of 3.5 sub-professional positions in a series that has 4 sub-professional grades. These are a Grade 3 managerial head, a Grade 2 records and file typist-clerk, a Grade 2 stack supervisor and processing assistant, a Grade 2 half-time circulation and processing assistant.

History. Prior to administrative re-organization in 1973, the Facility staff consisted of the full-time managerial head then at a Grade 2 level and allocations of casual Grade 1 assistance varying seasonally between 1 and 3.5 FTE positions. This was supplemented by casual campus staffing at student Assistant and Grade 1 levels in three Main Building Departments that varied between estimated ranges of 2 and 4 FTE.

Planning. When heavy new storage begins after completion of present new construction, it is expected the permanent staff at the Facility will have to be increased by one new Grade 1 position. During the past year, experiments with simplification of storage processing, which seem successful, suggest that the function of this position will be to assist with the increased local load of records work and the increased load of re-shelving. (See below, PROCESSING - Records). A related experiment in staff training suggests that a further shift in present staffing can be implemented next year. The Assistant University Librarian has a half-time Grade 3 assistant and a 15-hour student assistant, who now spend about half their time in support of coordination activities relating to storage. The probability is that much of this storage-related time can be transferred to the Facility staff by having present Facility staff spend a weekly day and half-days on campus.

Problems. In addition to the staffing indicated, an estimated half a position in the campus Mail Room is devoted to pick-up, trucking, and delivery of circulation from storage. Earlier planning to have Mail Room assume the load of delivery of new storage from campus to the Facility has proved impossible to implement. For the present, the inconveniences of accumulating large loads of new storage for delivery by non-Library truckers continue to pose problems of seasonal traffic peaks that have plagued the storage operation since the beginning of storage.

SELECTION

Responsibilities have already been indicated. At the present advanced stage of operation, when most units that store have reviewed their collections more than once, actual shelf-review has become an almost unavoidable first step. Various economies in time of follow up from the selection decision make it desirable that the reviewing officer be accompanied by a student assistant

when he conducts his review. Some review of past practices and approaches may be of interest.

History. Initially, much of the work of selection could be delegated, and prior to 1967/68 (when the entire central collection had finally been reviewed title by title for the first time) much of the selection was on the basis of a reading of shelf-list cards rather than of a review of books on shelves. The card-reading approach offers the advantage of minimizing the stages between choice of storage and provision of copy for records of storage. In fact, the following ranges of qualification have been typical of selection personnel: undergraduate student assistants examining shelf-list cards or book spines and date-due slips according to specific instructions, graduate students hired for specific ad hoc reviews after consultation with chairmen of Faculty departments, faculty members wishing to conduct their own reviews with special assistance of various sorts provided by the Library, professional library subject specialists at various professional levels, including Assistant University Librarians. Many selection officers in branches and in some service units delegate choice to high-level sub-professional assistants, acting on their own initiative or under general direction.

Problems. Main problems are characteristic of the operation and have not varied over the years. In summary, they involve alternatives of economy or waste in the transmission of the selection choice to the next stage of follow-up operation.

Planning. Present planning involves the possibility of directing some low-use new acquisitions to storage, rather than to campus shelves, at some stage of initial processing when the item is first handled by central Catalog Department. (The enclosed recent Minutes will indicate some of the range of preliminary discussion).

PROCESSING

Book Shifts. The present operation, tested last summer, has been designed to reduce the interval during which new storage is inaccessible after removal from campus shelves. Depending on conditions of casual staffing for handling large loads, it has been possible to reduce the norm for inaccessibility from three to four months to two to three weeks. The improvement has involved (a) radical simplification of processing routines at the Facility, (b) careful coordination of removal from shelf and boxing, (c) recent creation of a new area of pre-processing free shelving at the Facility, (d) a simple change in past habits of unloading new boxed storage at the Facility. At the Facility shelving capacity was exhausted two years ago, and the creation of the new pre-processing area was made possible a year ago by utilization of scrap shelving installed in floor space adjacent to the office and not to be occupied by new construction. Present expectation is that this area will remain as a permanent feature of the Facility. It has a capacity of about 25,000 volumes.

Records. Campus. These vary considerably, according to preference of the unit storing. As originally conceived, the campus record is a local charge to another location, so that storage is typically retrievable only through the intervention of the unit that has stored, and public records of the collections remain unchanged. Professional habits and prejudices about custodial ownership remain strong among both faculty and librarians, so that no early change in conception seems likely. In some units, the record is part of the charge file, in others, the record is added to the shelf list. One

unit indicates storage by marking all public cards in the set with a felt pen. There has been considerable pressure and some initial action to represent storage in the central Author-Title Catalog by jacketing cards with a plastic cover bearing a standard message. Because records are scattered and filed in call number order, the unavoidable workload of pulling and filing cards has delayed significant progress in jacketing. Campus units are now furnished with copies of the recently revised form of records, but there is no effort to impose editorial format consistency throughout the Library system. (For clarification of the recent changes in records, see the sample sheets of both old and new forms in Appendix 1).

Records. Storage Facility. After experimentation during the past year, Facility records have been adapted in the following ways to serve new purposes without requiring reconversion of former records. Records are now in two files. The retained old file, intended to match the campus record exactly, has the same construction as formerly: main arrangement is by campus unit storing, and within each of these subdivisions, filing is strictly by call number. The new file, intended to function as a central record of storage, is a single array catalog, with records filed alphabetically by title. In both files, the bibliographic record since last summer is of a new format; it is a copy of the formal Catalog Department unit card, with added Storage Facility shelf number, and second-card records of particular stored holdings for serial titles. New records are created by xeroxing shelf-list cards to produce new three-card sets, which the Storage Facility adds information to during processing, and of which one copy is returned to the campus unit for its own final record of storage. (See examples in Appendix 1).

Storage Facility Shelving Patterns A major change, planned during the past six months and still to be tested fully, was designed to economize processing time by eliminating many intermediate stages. The intended effect is to preserve most advantages of physically compacting volumes and simultaneously to break down former distinctions between the handling of fully cataloged books and the handling of books which are retrievable without classing. In the new system, eight former shelving sizes have been reduced to four, and stored volumes no longer shelve along the fore-edge to display a retrieving added shelf-number of the bottom edge (the YA, YB .. YH series of numbers in the examples of records). And volumes now shelve in normal position, for retrieval by original call number. Under the new system, the new work of interfiling incoming volumes substitutes for multiple manipulations of volumes under the old. The costs of the slight space loss under the new system are insignificant in comparison with the staffing costs of striving for maximal compactness. An additional reason for abandoning the system of eight sizes may be of interest. Four of the old sizes are ineffective as modes of compacting: publishing habits yield few books that fit into either of the two smallest size norms, and the two largest sizes have always shelved normally at the Facility because of spine strain that the weight of volumes would impose if they were shelved on the fore-edge. Under the new system, new storage accumulates in lines of four sizes shelving in call number order to the 25,000 volume capacity of the new pre-processing area. The entire block is then transferred to its permanent position. No physical marking is added to the volumes. Final processing consists of stamping the card records for the volumes according to a simplified pattern of stamping. The shelf location stamp (applied only to the record) necessary for retrieval is a repeated set of the four same numbers applied to the entire block. (For example, no volume will match a distinctive shelf number, but every volume in the block will be identifiable for ready

retrieval by the size indications "01", "02", "03", or "04", which identify the particular block, and its individual call number, which determines its shelving sequence.) As the last stage of charging for circulation, developed past practice has created the routine of adding an adhesive colored dot to the spine of the circulating book. This dot identified the volume as one meant to shelve at the Facility. When the circulating volume is returned, the cleared Facility charge record is slipped into the volume to indicate location for ready re-shelving. Occasional reshelving problems have always been easily solved by consulting the Facility record of processed storage.

History. The evolution of changes would be tedious to relate and intolerable to read, even in summary. Some general comment may be of interest. At the administrative level, the old system -- planned to be cheap -- became in fact unusually expensive. Division of main administrative responsibilities and local preferences about having personnel report only to single supervisors increased two kinds of hidden costs, with serious impairment to the efficacy of the whole operation. Administrative costs were high because any proposed change in routines or any exceptions to routine required initial consensus among three or four officers of the top administration. Managerial costs were increased because of the impossibility of supervising or instructing storage personnel formally under the supervision of a colleague. During the period when Faculty interest in storage required frequent formal communication between the Library administrator responsible for selection and teaching departments, this need (now no longer pressing) added to the high costs of ordinary communication. The actual labor cost of storage was in fact cheap in terms of wage scales, since most necessary labor was done by casuals at the bottom of the scales, but the operation as a whole was labor consumptive. Technological lag obstructed some possibilities of improvement in routines. Until new card sets could easily be reproduced from Catalog Department unit cards, there could be no alternative to manual production of new records by typing. Records of storage had to be designed to be minimally informative. (Because they were produced by casual student assistants, given minimal instruction and not supervised, old records are often discovered to be inaccurate, and even under the present system take much time to correct.) Necessary economies in typing forced reliance on such expedients as thin carbons and photoclerk copy, which added particular difficulties to ordinary problems of file maintenance. Proliferating misconceptions about practical criteria for storage selection continued to raise meaningless obstacles until (a) growth of total storage accustomed users to accept this inconvenience in access, (b) some professional library selectors became sufficiently pressed by problems of collection growth and stack maintenance to be willing to forego deliberate niceties of critical choice, (c) progressive restriction of campus stack space forced a common appreciation of the primary need to keep some unit shelving free for ordinary new growth, (d) it could be demonstrated (as it has recently been) that lags in delivery and in accessibility of new storage can be significantly decreased by improving routines and communication. Constriction of campus space has finally forced several issues -- and, happily, some solutions. Funding delays in State authorization of new construction at the Facility created a crisis three years ago, which is now finally to be relieved there, though there is no immediate relief for campus stack constriction, now universal in all large collection units of the Library system.

Problems. Delivery continues to set nagging problems. They remain tolerable now chiefly because the level of storage use remains too low for an investment to be feasible in either the equipment or additional staffing that would be needed for significant improvement. Records for both stored

holdings and circulating storage continue to pose problems of consistency and match that only automation can be expected to meet satisfactorily. At present, there is no avoiding the necessity to have storage records in duplicate (and occasionally multiple) files. Full efficacy of records inevitably depends on shared access to a single record instead of the present multiplicity of records deriving from different sources. Significant improvement in service seems essentially dependent on changes in patterns of record-keeping and delivery. (For circulation workloads over the decade, see Appendix II.)

Planning. Several main areas have already been indicated. Significant changes all depend on inter-institutional decisions about cooperation. One long-range effect of automation seems likely to change social expectations about library service -- with consequences not easy to foresee. The present stage of the operation already indicates that (a) whenever storage occurs, ordinary distinctions of classing cease to be functional; (b) adequacy of access to stored items loses any relationship with shelf-marks (except at the Facility) and becomes dependent on analyzed fulness of bibliographic description; (c) for ordinary purposes, copy of the informational text or data is as satisfying as the original. Professional reaction to change seems now sufficiently slow to encourage a suspicion that these foregoing three views do not have the cogency of recognized social fact. Ultimately, present concern about ownership and funding may yield to pressures of common social interest in access, but these prospects seem distant now.

CIRCULATION AND USE

The Facility is open five days per week from 8 to 5 and closed on weekends. From the beginning, the Library has offered two patterns of use: readers wishing to examine a long file of a serial are encouraged to visit the Facility and do their preliminary scanning there; other readers can expect normal delivery within 24 hours of presenting requests to campus units. Possibly because no transportation is provided, almost no users chose to scan files at the Facility, and it is occasionally a problem to have to return 150 to 200 volumes of a serial for preliminary scanning on campus.

The routines for circulation are the following. Before 8 AM a special Mail Room truck delivers to the Facility requests received before 5 PM the previous day and also discharged volumes returning to the Facility for re-shelving. During the noon hour, the truck returns to the Facility to pick up the volumes for which requests were delivered that morning, or any other emergency requests a campus unit may have phoned in to the Facility staff. During the early part of the afternoon, Main Building units pick up and prepare the day's incoming charges and the Mail Room delivers incoming charges to branch units. As its own local charge file, the Facility creates a call number of shelf number record of what it has sent to campus, which contains only that number, the date sent, and the campus unit requesting the volume. The routine is simple and there are no problems traceable to it.

History. Two years ago, a number of nagging problems were solved by instituting the following changes in previous practice. Facility mail is addressed directly to the unit -- or occasionally the person -- requesting the stored item. Previously, all requests and traffic of storage were routed to and through central Circulation Department for sorting, final addressing, and ultimate delivery; so that in effect every piece had to pass through the Mail Room twice the number of times it now does, and Circulation Department had to maintain a third charge file additional to the one in the campus unit

and the one at the Facility. Several other problems were resolved by authorizing campus personnel to communicate directly with Facility staff. The former practice had been to channel all communication hierarchically. As occasional problems now arise, they are generally settled by ad hoc conferences of interested parties. During the past two years, there have been three of these.

Problems. The Library would like to change social habit so as to route users who wish to scan long files of serials, or do other browsing, directly to the Facility. Browsing in the usual sense is impossible in the compacted collections of books, but on request the Facility staff pages specified items or files for local browsing, and occasionally an unusual user browses through specified monographs in this way. A little other browsing and scanning is permitted and used by faculty wishing to scan block collections that shelve at the Facility in the original order inherited from the storing unit on campus. When such browsing results in a charge, the Facility makes the charge directly and forwards it to the related campus unit. New techniques of processing indicated above will facilitate some limited (though tedious) kind of shelf browsing, and it may be that this will effect a change in faculty habit at least. The Library would not wish to encourage and the Facility could not easily tolerate general or heavy browsing.

There is no discernible explanation of two noticed peculiarities about use. Rate of use does not increase significantly with storage. Variable monthly peaks in circulation loads cannot be related to specific patterns of variation in overall campus use.

Planning. An automated circulation system is being planned for the northern campuses served by the Storage Facility, and as it is implemented on particular campuses, size of campus unit circulation will determine date of installation in a particular unit. On this campus, the largest collection by far is also the most heavily stored and the most heavily used, so that expectation now is that automation will affect the most considerable part of the present Facility collections. (It should be recalled that Facility collections are formally a conglomerate of extensions of campus unit collections.) Effects of automation will almost certainly affect habits of use and possibly volume of circulation. In any event, it seems reasonable to expect an increase in requests for information about storage as soon as expected delays in reply can be decreased automatically; and to expect also some related decrease in number of volumes requested.

Planning about regional cooperation has involved a complex of use studies and studies of composition and overlap of collections. Several of these have implications for storage that are now being considered at inter-institutional levels. Related local and regional planning about microforming, preservation, and growth containment are also expected to affect planning about storage. But no information about such planning is available now for general dissemination.

J. Michel

2-14-75

PLANNING DOCUMENTS

COMMITTEE ON THE TRANSFER OF LIBRARY MATERIALS
REPORT

This committee met several times during March, April and May 1975. We decided that our first order of business should be a visit to Tyson Research Center. We did this to gain a first-hand idea of what the area and the bunkers looked like, what modernization had taken place, and what traveling time was involved in going back and forth.

As we began to talk, we realized we had several reasons for finding this assignment difficult to approach. First, we could see no immediacy for planning for storage. Second, one bunker now used by the libraries must be vacated in the near future and there is not another one ready to receive the material already there. And third, we can find no reason to believe progress is being made on the renovation of bunkers assigned to the libraries.

However, in spite of these frustrations, we make the following recommendations to be considered when the appropriate time comes.

A. Selection of material to be transferred

1. Any staff member, with a serious suggestion of a title that might be considered for transfer from any collection to another, should feel free to send the suggestion to the Principal Bibliographer by means of completing Form 285 (see attached)

2. The Principal Bibliographer reviews the request, seeking advice from others when he chooses and either approves the request or returns it to the requesting staff member with his reasons for a denial. There is a place on Form 285 to be checked if the staff member is not particularly concerned with the decision.

3. If an appeal is made, it should be made to the University Librarian, who would make the final decision.

B. Criteria for selection

Any title can be considered for transfer - especially to Tyson Research Center. Any request made based on space considerations should be sent to Tyson instead of Olin unless very convincing justification is presented. Departmental titles should not be given precedence over general titles for space in Olin.

If it is determined that an effort must be made to make space available in Olin, the committee suggests having a list of dead or cancelled serials compiled by the Serials Division - or taken from the new union list. The list should be given to the Principal Bibliographer, who in turn selects those titles which could be transferred to Tyson Research Center. This determination should be made on the basis of predicted use. Monographs should be selected on their individual merits.

C. Arrangement of materials at Tyson Research Center

1. In order to keep shifting to a minimum, it would be useful to have two or three bunkers renovated and ready to receive materials before any processed material

is transferred to Tyson Research Center. School and Departmental titles should be shelved separately from Olin titles - and Olin oversize should have its own shelving area. Any unprocessed material should be maintained in an entirely separate area.

2. The committee strongly recommends that titles at Tyson should be shelved the same way they are here - by classification number. Other methods considered would be more costly in staff time and in the preparation and keeping of records.

It is also suggested that books bought for Reserve and no longer needed in that division, be sent to Tyson for storage, and if not recalled within a reasonable time, be withdrawn.

D. Record keeping

It is recommended that an automated list be kept of the processed materials at Tyson Research Center.

1. It should not be part of the daily print-out, but be a separate list - to be updated periodically.

2. A system must be devised to convert any book cards that are not IBM to that type.

3. The automated list should be kept at the Circulation desk. Some or all departmental libraries might want copies of the list in addition to the one at Circulation.

4. Discharge records and any needed statistics should be available from the automated system.
5. No attempt should be made to plan the specifics of a program until the time of implementation approaches.
6. Recall and retrieval should be done on a manual system.

E. Retrieval

Under the direction of the Building/Security Assistant.

1. Frequency.

The once-a-week procedure now in effect is sufficient until the number of titles in storage becomes large enough to create a demand. At that time, a change in both frequency and staffing should be considered. All persons dealing with retrieval should know the schedule of trips to Tyson and should know that schedule will be met unless no requests are made by a specified time.

2. Request form.

Should be the same as the Circulation Recall Card - but be printed in another color.

F. Physical facilities at Tyson

1. No staff should be expected to work more than 2-3 hours in a bunker without light, heat, temperature and humidity control, plumbing and other necessities.
2. A telephone should be in any bunker where staff is working for an extended time. Also a phone would be useful for retrieval staff if there are questions about requested material or if assistance is needed.
3. No material should be put in unrenovated bunkers

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63130

TO: Department Chiefs, Departmental & School Librarians

FROM:

RE: Transfer of Publications Between Library Collections

The attached form has been revised to facilitate the transfer of materials between library collections. Form 285, revised on this date, should be used for transferring publications between campus libraries, publications within Olin Departments (including monographs in the Reference and Bibliography Collections) and publications to Tyson Research Center.

Because of the high costs of technical services, requests for transfer should be kept to a minimum.

The following procedures are now in effect:

1. Request (Form 285) is sent to Principal Bibliographer.
2. Principal Bibliographer makes decision, taking into consideration all pertinent questions involved. If in doubt, he seeks advice from others.
3. If approval is granted, the request, along with the book, is sent to the Catalog Department. If a set consisting of several volumes is approved for transfer into the Olin General Collection, a copy of the approved request is sent to the Circulation Department. If for any reason, approval is not granted, the request is returned to the requester explaining the denial.
4. The Catalog Department contacts the requester when the material can be processed if multiple volumes are involved.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63130

Request for Transfer of Publications

Between Library Collections

_____ Informal suggestion (To be checked if the idea is ONLY an informal suggestion to be pursued at the discretion of Principal Bibliographer - no response will be sent requester)

Publication proposed for transfer:

Call no. Entry:

Number of volumes

If serial or set, currently received?

_____ yes _____ no

Current collection

Proposed collection

Justification for transfer (This should include reasons for a preference for a campus location if specifically not wanted at Tyson Research Center)

Requested by:

Date _____

Approved by:

Date _____

Princeton University Library

Growth of the Collections

1965-1985

Introduction

This memorandum summarizes an attempt to estimate the growth of the collections of the Princeton University Library to 1985 and to identify tentatively the physical space which might be assigned to these collections for their adequate care and use during this period. It thus represents an attempt to bring up to date and to project further into the future two earlier space planning summaries: a memorandum from the Librarian to the Trustees Committee on the Library and the Faculty Committee on the Library, "Long range space requirements of the Princeton University Library," (January 5, 1959), and a memorandum from the Librarian to the President, "An analysis of space requirements in the Firestone Library to 1975," (June 6, 1963).

For the purpose of this analysis the University Library is arbitrarily broken down into the following elements:

- I. Firestone Library
 - A. Open-stack collections
 - B. Closed-stack collections and special-purpose rooms.
- II. Compact Storage Building
- III. Elements of the Library outside Firestone
 - A. Accelerator
 - B. Art and Archaeology
 - C. Biology
 - D. Chemistry
 - E. Engineering - River & Harbor
 - F. Forrestal
 - G. Geology
 - H. Julian Street
 - I. Mathematics-Physics
 - J. Oriental

- K. Plasma Physics
- L. Population Research
- M. Psychology
- N. 20th Century Manuscripts
- O. Woodrow Wilson

Although it seems possible that these collections could be housed as indicated until 1985, except for certain problem areas which are noted, it seems probable that unanticipated changes in the University's program of teaching and research or the need for additional services will require revision of this tentative plan. It should serve, however, as a basis for further planning as required.

It should be noted especially that this is a tentative plan for the housing of the collections only. It does not take into account additional space which may be needed for readers or for staff, although it is believed that these needs may be accommodated in ways which will be compatible with this proposed deployment of the collections. Study of these space requirements for readers and staff will be continued, and the advisability of some solution of the reserve desk problem outside Firestone will be studied in particular.

Princeton University Library

Growth of the Collections

I. Firestone Library

A. Open-stack collections -
books and bound journals.
(Read with Appendix A)

1. On July 1, 1965 there will be approximately 1,025,000 volumes on the open stacks of Firestone.
 - Estimate by actual count of loaded shelves.
2. At about the same time the areas permanently allocated to open stack use in Firestone will have an approximate capacity of 1,067,000 volumes.
 - This estimate is essentially the present open-stack shelving plus the area released by the removal of the temporary Marquand Library installation. This estimate is based on the assumption that the various areas now enclosed will be neither enlarged nor reduced in any way which either reduces or enlarges the area devoted to open stacks. (See memorandum of June 6, 1963, to President Goheen from W.S. Dix, p. 2A, for some details of space allocations.)
3. The total collections of the University Library seem to be growing at the rate of approximately 3.2% per year, compounded annually.
 - See Appendix B for tables of library growth at Princeton and at other universities.
4. Assuming that the open stack collections in Firestone (more than half of the total) grow at the same rate as the total collections, the approximate capacity (as in 2) will be reached late in 1966.
 - The same conclusion, reached by a quite different method, was presented in my memorandum of June 6, 1963.
5. Relief may be gained by the removal of books from the open stacks as follows:
 - 140,000 volumes in science and technology (C floor)
 - Most of these books should be reunited to the biology and geology collections in whatever space is provided for them. Some can be retired to compact storage.

- 22,000 volumes in the Near East collections (3rd floor)
- These could be removed with the Far Eastern collections to another building.

6. Additional shelf space may be gained by removing certain collections in closed areas and adding this space to open stack areas, as follows:

- for 71,000 volumes by removing the Far Eastern Collection (Gest Library) to another building.
- for 27,000 volumes by removing certain 20th century MS material to another building.

7. These removals and changes would result in a collection in 1975 of 1,182,000 volumes and a capacity of 1,165,000.

8. Removal to compact storage of 25% of the books remaining in the Firestone open-stacks in 1965 and 15% of the 1965-75 increment by 1975 would leave a collection of 850,000 and a capacity of 1,165,000.

- The experience of some other institutions suggests that 25% may be high for humanistic collections such as those in Firestone. But the collections have not been weeded for many years, and I believe that we can remove 25% of the 1965 collections, and perhaps 15% of the increment after that.

9. Removal to compact storage of 15% of the 1975-85 increment would leave by 1985 a collection of 1,120,000 and a capacity of 1,165,000.

- But note that this calculation assumes that 15% of the 1975-85 increment can be removed during those years. It will obviously become increasingly difficult to retire books to storage as the collection becomes progressively leaner, and this rate of retirement may be too ambitious.

10. Allowing for the speculative nature of these estimates, it appears that before 1985 removal of a major segment of the collections from Firestone or a major addition to Firestone will be required.

11. The extension of A,B, and C floors to a depth of 3 bays toward Nassau Street would provide shelf space for an estimated 1,024,000 volumes, allowing space for 217 new carrels and for 24 new reading oases.

- See attachment C for an estimate of carrel requirements, based on present needs and anticipated enrolments. Whenever the building is expanded additional oases should be provided for convenient use of stack books and for general expansion of reading space.

Princeton University Library

Growth of the Collections

I. Firestone Library

B. Closed-stack collections and special-purpose rooms.

Considerable rearrangement of the space in Firestone now devoted to closed-stack collections and special-purpose rooms will probably be required, but in general the total amount of this space available in 1965 may be adequate to 1985. Further study of these needs will be made during the coming year.

Princeton University Library

Growth of the Collections

II. Compact Storage Building

According to present plans, an essential element of the Princeton University Library will be a building to which seldom used volumes can be retired subject to immediate recall for use. Assuming that 25% of the 1965 collections can be retired and 15% of future increments, space will be required by 1985 as follows:

In 1965

Total collection	1,757,000 vols.
25% to storage	439,000 vols.
Sq. ft. required	8,780 sq. ft. (net)
(at 50 vols./ sq. ft.)	

In 1975

Total collection	2,409,000 vols.
Growth, 1965-75 (at 3.2%)	652,000 vols.
15% to storage	98,000 vols.
Sq. ft. required	1,960 sq. ft. (net)
Total sq. ft. to 1975	10,740 sq. ft. (net)

In 1985

Total collection	3,309,000 vols.
Growth, 1975-85 (at 3.2%)	900,000 vols.
15% to storage	135,000 vols.
Sq. ft. required	2,700 sq. ft. (net)
Total sq. ft. to 1985	13,440 sq. ft. (net)

THE FOLLOWING SECTION (III) IS AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST FROM THE SPEC FILES

BEST COPY

Conclusion

I. Firestone Library

Some relief for the open-stack collections in Firestone is needed immediately.

By the removal of certain collections and the other changes indicated the open shelves in Firestone should be adequate through 1975 without any further addition to the building.

A major addition to the building should be contemplated between 1975 and 1985.

The areas devoted to special collections in Firestone may be adequate to 1975 if the Gest Collection and the large 20th Century Manuscript collections are removed.

(Note that these estimates do not make provision for additional space for readers and staff until after 1975. Carrel space in particular will be needed, and ways of providing it are under study.)

II. Compact Storage Area

A compact storage building is an essential element of these plans. The accommodation of various collections to the areas assigned to them will be impossible without the compact storage building.

The process of selecting and recataloguing books for compact storage takes time, and the building should be provided as soon as possible in order to meet the schedule indicated here.

III. Collections outside Firestone

Space for the following seems to be adequate to 1985, subject to the conditions indicated:

Accelerator
Art and Archaeology
Astronomy
Chemistry - if additional room in Frick can be made
available and if all biochemistry is not
housed in Frick.
Engineering - if basement of library wing is converted
for library use.
Geology - if all of Eno is made available to Library.
Julian Street
Mathematics-Physics - if basement is provided in new
building.
Plasma Physics
Psychology
Woodrow Wilson

The space problems of the following collections remain
unresolved as indicated:

Biology - some immediate relief from expansion into space
in Guyot now occupied by geology collections, but still
inadequate.
Forrestal - relief for a few years provided by current
remodelling of Sayre Hall, but major solution needed.
Oriental - proposed relocation in Fine-Palmer adequate
for a few years, to 1985 if expansion there can be
provided.
Population Research - Adequate until 1975. Future of
Ivy Lane building not clear.
20th Century Manuscripts - Rate of growth not clear, but
relocation outside Firestone probably desirable. No
site yet proposed.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
Growth of the Collections
(Printed books in standard volumes)

I. Firestone Library - Open-stack Collections

	<u>1965</u>	<u>1975</u>	<u>1985</u>
With no major removals and no building additions (at growth rate of 3.2% compounded annually)	Volumes: 1,025,000 Capacity: 1,027,000	1,405,000 1,067,000	1,930,000 1,067,000
With removal from the open stacks of Science books 140,000 Near East Collections 22,000 (less books) 16,000	Volumes: 1,025,000 - 162,000 863,000	1,182,000	1,622,000
With removal from closed area of Far East Collections 71,000 20th Century Mss. 27,000 (more capacity) 98,000	Capacity: 1,067,000 + 98,000 1,165,000	1,165,000	1,165,000
With removal of percentages of the Collection to compact storage.	Volumes: 863,000 -25% * 216,000 647,000 Capacity: 1,165,000	886,000 -15% ** 36,000 850,000 1,165,000	1,164,000 -15% ** 44,000 1,120,000 1,165,000
With addition of 3-bay North Extension 1,024,000 vols.	Volumes: --	--	1,120,000
- Allowing for 217 new carrels (18 bays) and 20 new reading oases (10 bays).	Capacity: --	--	1,165,000 +1,024,000 2,189,000

Appendix A

December 22, 1964

* Of total

** Of increment

127

BEST COPY 128

081

April 8, 1975

Revised Draft of statement on off-campus storage prepared for review by Library Board. The final version of this will be submitted to Provost Knapp.

In reviewing various priorities with respect to the problems currently facing the University Libraries, I have come to the conclusion that the acquisition of space for off-campus library storage is the most crucial in the short term because it affects program planning over the next three years and unless the immediate problem can be eased our longer range efforts to respond with new approaches to the problems of physical growth will be greatly complicated.

The Problem: In common with most other major universities the planning for library facilities at Cornell has turned out to be relatively short term.

As you are aware the Libraries are again faced with a space problem which is acute and immediate.

The basic long term problem it seems to me is how to deal with the physical growth of the collections. Space for the collections is one of the major elements in dealing with physical growth but it is not the only element. We are already seeing a reduced rate of growth which means that some of the projections that have been made in the past may not be entirely accurate. To a considerable extent this reduced rate of growth is a factor of forced reduction in acquisitions rather than in the rate of production of scholarly publications and research materials. The latter problem involves more than libraries and is one that must be acted upon within a broad range of interests which will include the entire library and academic communities.

During this year we are expecting to discuss the possibility of a survey by the University Microfilms, Inc. to determine the practical aspects of a fairly massive microfilming program that might prove to be cost beneficial. It is clear that from all available studies that the cost of off-campus storage is less than the cost of microfilming and that the benefits in terms of space to be realized by microfilming do not offset that cost. However, when one combines the storage advantage of microfilming with the benefits of improved preservation and reduced binding costs and the fact that those things that would be microfilmed would be things which ought to be retained in a central campus library rather than off-campus storage, the cost benefits begin to be recognizable.

April 8, 1975

Another element in the solution of the problem of physical growth is national storage centers like the Center for Research Libraries for certain categories of material. The savings here are not entirely in terms of space savings but offer cost savings for acquisitions since the kinds of materials that would be stored at distant points would be expensive serial and periodical runs.

Technological advances with respect to computer applications to library problems are an element in our immediate planning, and the tremendous improvement in accessibility of bibliographical data through national computer networks in which we are already participating is expected to have substantial indirect impact on problems of physical growth through making cooperative services and distant storage more practical.

Possible Choices in Responding to the Problem

1. Off-campus storage. There appears to be general agreement that some form of off-campus storage should be a major part of the response both in the short and long term.

a. Regional Storage through FAUL. In discussing off-campus storage with the Library Board there was a strong sense that we should not foreclose the possibility of a regional approach to the problem through FAUL. The Mineka Committee recommended a cooperative storage facility as part of the FAUL program. Subsequent to the discussion with the Library Board, Professor Elledge and I raised the question with the FAUL directors and received indications of strong interest. This took two forms.

(1) The recognition that, in spite of the fact that major library construction has taken place within the past two years on four of the five campuses, it was important that FAUL consider now as a group whether the long term FAUL program should provide for common storage or indeed a common library facility. As a first step the FAUL Board agreed to put this matter on the agenda for its two-day planning session that is scheduled in May to review FAUL objectives and future programs. Furthermore, it was suggested that, if the planning session reached some conclusions, it would be appropriate to place the matter on the agenda for the meeting in September when the FAUL directors meet with the Presidents of the member institutions.

In 1970 FAUL was apparently considering the notion of central storage and a technical memorandum was prepared entitled

April 8, 1975

An Analysis of Book Storage and Transportation Requirements of the Five Associated University Libraries that presented and analyzed a substantial amount of data which is still relevant. I assume that the issue was not pursued at the time because of the local library building plans of four of the five members.

(2) The examination of the possibility of an immediate short range response to the Cornell problem by utilizing temporarily space in one or another of the other member libraries. It was agreed by the group that a survey of available stack space be made by Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Binghamton. Such short term use would be practical only if a longer range solution was already well developed.

b. Cornell University storage.

(1) FBC Building. As you are aware a considerable amount of planning has been done with respect to an off-campus Cornell library storage facility in Ithaca. During the past two years this has focused on the FBC building at the East Ithaca Plaza. For your information, I am reviewing some of the planning that has taken place during the past two years.

In a position paper prepared by Thomas Mackesey on January 10, 1973, he suggested that the University build a library storage facility on Warren Road. Approximately 1 1/2 years later the possibility of acquiring the FBC store on Judd Falls Road was discussed by the Library Space Planning Committee as an option.

Mr. Shepherd wrote to Mr. Mackesey in January of 1974 requesting that the Libraries be assigned 30,000 sq. ft. at the east end of the FBC building. This left about 20,000 sq. ft. for other purposes. Mr. Shepherd saw this as a five-year interim plan to relieve immediate pressing space needs for the Libraries. He suggested that during these five years a master plan be developed. Mr. Shepherd proposed that large amounts of bulk material be moved to the storage facility with as few record changes as possible. He also referred to the need for building a fire wall to separate the materials in storage from the rest of the building. Industrial shelving, humidity controls, smoke and heat sensors, a fumigator, office space, reading area, a copy machine and transportation to and from campus will be required.

The projected cost at that time was given as \$228,400 which included shelving and equipment, staff (truck driver and two support staff) and moving expense. Mr. Shepherd indicated that the library

April 8, 1975

might wish to expand its space in the facility at a later date. He suggested that the South Central Research Library Council be invited to occupy some of the space in the interim.

A report from Thomas Mackesey to the Ad Hoc Committee on Library Facilities dated March 26, 1974, supported the proposal to acquire the FBC space as a first-step in the alleviation of the library space problem.

A sub-committee of the Research Policies Committee of the Faculty Council of Representatives considered the question of the FBC building in March 1974. It is my understanding that while they did not endorse the specific plan, they did not reject it.

On July 22, 1974, Lewis Roscoe reported that the Library Space Planning Committee had reached agreement that an off-campus storage facility is required as soon as it can be provided.

(2) New modular construction. An inexpensive warehouse building of a modular type to be built on the perimeter of the campus was proposed at the time the FBC building was first considered. It is certainly a possible alternative to the FBC building.

c. National library storage centers. The Center for Research Libraries is such a storage center and Cornell is a member. Professor Stuart Brown is the retiring Chairman of its Board of Directors. Its present program is undergoing rather intensive review with a possibility that it will be redirected toward becoming a national lending library for libraries somewhat like the Lending Division of the British Library rather than simply a storage center. It is my understanding that the CRL has not accepted any deposits from its members for the past five years. In any case a national storage center can only provide for a portion of the storage requirements that a major research library would have. It would be a significant factor in any long range planning but could not be a complete alternative to a local or regional facility. In any event it will be necessary to await the results of the program review that its Board of Directors is now undertaking.

In summary it is apparent that there is general agreement that an off-campus storage facility is urgently needed. Concern was expressed by several persons that this facility not be used as a substitute for expansion of library facilities on campus.

April 8, 1975

I have talked with Vice President Matyas and Mr. Roscoe concerning the present status of planning for a library storage center and we are agreed that the FBC building appears to represent a very good solution to the library's space problems, which in my view would go beyond the estimate of five years suggested in the earlier estimate made by the Library administration. In addition to providing relatively early relief to immediate space problems, it has the strong possibility of providing a long term storage center either as a Cornell center or as a regional FAUL center. This judgment is based on the following reasons:

1. The floor space required for five years including a sizable movement of archival material was based on 30,000 square feet. An additional 20,000 square feet is available in the building with the site offering the possibility of expansion.
2. The centrality of the site in relation to other FAUL libraries and the fact of its proximity to the largest collection of the FAUL group makes it reasonable to consider it as a possibility for a regional center.

A less satisfactory alternative would be some means for temporary storage for two to three years through FAUL.

In either case it is necessary in my view to follow immediately with the preparation of a long range plan based on revised growth projections incorporating some of the new elements that are being developed nationally in response to the problems of physical growth. This plan should be developed, in my view, through the FAUL group in close coordination with other regional groupings of research libraries in the northeast such as the Research Library Group (Harvard, Yale, New York Public Library and Columbia).

/pa

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

MEMORANDUM

Date: December 29, 1976

To: R. M. Matyas
Vice President for Planning and Facilities
317 Day Hall

From: J. Gormly Miller *J. Gormly Miller*

Subject: Program for low cost Library Annex Facility.

The program requirements that appear on the attached outline for a Library Annex reflect in large measure the elements that have been discussed on many previous occasions and which have been reflected in the many memoranda that have been exchanged on the subject. Estimates of needs for short term capacity are for 300,000 to 400,000 volumes of books and periodicals plus 17,000 standard cartons of manuscript files and archival records. This represents three to five years of collection growth plus material already in compact storage in campus libraries and manuscript and archival files stored off-campus. While a high proportion of this storage capacity would release space in the Olin Library and other campus libraries for future growth, a measurable amount of it would be taken up simply to restore conditions in some of the book stack areas on campus to a satisfactory working capacity level. We estimate that approximately one half of the capacity of the new facility would be filled within one year with the balance being filled over the remaining two to four years depending largely on the staff resources available. Approximately 125,000 volumes could be moved from the Olin Library immediately. In addition 9,300 archive boxes could be immediately transferred from the Department of Manuscripts and University Archives. These latter would come largely from University warehouse storage that is now charged to the University library budget in the amount of \$2,000 per year.

The proposed program requirements represent, in my opinion, a satisfactory solution to the problem of providing low cost library book and archive record storage capacity off-campus for lesser used library materials. It needs to be recognized that in addition to construction costs there are certain operational costs involved in running a facility which must provide limited service and handle a level of traffic that will increase as the contents increase. It cannot be viewed as dead storage. It is assumed that library users will largely be served by a regular delivery service, and therefore must accept a certain level of inconvenience and service complications. It will not of course solve problems of overcrowded conditions for readers notably in the Uris, Mann and Olin Libraries.

The storage facility is expected to serve all campus libraries including the Department of Manuscripts and University Archives and other special collections. The basic requirements which reflect immediate short term needs will not be affected by other campus library planning, such as the Law School proposals for a major expansion of Law Library space or the plans that are being discussed in the College of Arts and Science for the Music Department and the Music Library. If such plans

were to be implemented the major effect they would have on the library storage facility would be a slight reduction in the projections of the rate at which future storage modules would be filled over the longer term.

As I mentioned to you in an earlier memorandum, we wish to include in the structure some staff work space of a size that would enable us to move the Library's Card Reproduction Unit into the storage facility. Because we would use the two operators now in the Card Reproduction Unit in a dual capacity to staff the on-site services of the Library storage facility this move would serve several objectives.

1. It would enable us to staff the facility at least during the first two or three years without adding or transferring staff from other library service operations and it would thereby reduce our estimate of operating costs below what we had originally set forth.

2. It would enable us to meet the recommendations of the Life Safety Division with respect to the present situation which does not meet their standards or codes. We have gotten estimates with respect to costs for meeting these standards within Olin and they would appear to be several thousand dollars.

3. In addition to realizing real savings in operating costs without adding measurably to the building requirement, it would provide better staff coverage for the annex facility because there would be two full-time people involved in case of illness or other absence whereas if we try to staff it with one full-time person for the book storage operation only, we have the schedule complications and interruptions of service that result from this type of coverage for a remote location.

/pa

cc: D. C. Knapp
W. G. Herbst
W. D. Cooke
S. A. Lawrence
R. M. Ramin
L. S. Roscoe

att.

Program Outline for Library Annex Facility

A. Objective:

To meet immediate short term needs - three to five years - for storage of lesser used books and periodicals and manuscript files and archival records.

To provide minimum service capability and access as required.

B. General Requirements:

1. Modular construction - to permit expansion of basic capacity for future needs.

2. Site location within a ten minute radius of campus by car - to permit easy access and parking by car and truck and if possible adjacent or near to campus bus stop; to allow for future expansion of storage modules.

C. Type of Structure:

1. Multi-tier self-supporting stack within building shell. This is based on examination of similar library storage structures and indications are that this offers most economical construction costs per volume stored. Three tiers appears to be the optimum height for efficient operation.

2. Storage structure containing simple freight elevator with low attached structure for staff work area, receiving, loading and sorting area, toilet facilities, and consulting area.

D. <u>Space:</u>	Capacity	Equipment & Furnishings
1. Storage area		
Basic 1st module - for 3 tiers of stack each of 10,000 sq. ft.	300,000 - 400,000 vols.	Industrial shelving for 3 tiers Dimensions to accommodate 4 to 6 sizes of books and periodicals
	17,000 archive boxes	Dimensions to accommodate double shelving of standard size archive box.

D. <u>Space</u> continued:	Capacity	Equipment & Furnishings
2. Receiving Area		
Covered Loading Dock, 100 sq. ft.	1 12X6 truck (?)	
Receiving Area 400 sq. ft., with 1 sink	12 library book trucks	Counter space
Bulk Handling Area 250 sq. ft.	Sorting and tem- porary storage	Counter space Bins and shelves
Supply Area 300 sq. ft.	Cartons, shipping cases, office supplies	Shelves and bins
Total 1050 sq. ft.		
3. Office & Reception Desk 150 sq. ft.	1 person	Desk, 2 chairs
4. Work area, including card reproduction unit/with necessary ventilation to meet Life Safety standards 600 sq. ft.	2 persons	Existing
5. Toilets, Janitor's Closet as required, 100 sq. ft.		
6. Consultation Room 400 sq. ft.	4 persons	4 tables, 4 chairs shelving

Notes - Recommend that all non-storage areas be grouped in low structure attached to multi-tiered storage structure and that office and work spaces be adjacent to receiving and loading areas rather than removed from them.

E. Mechanicals:

The books and other materials to be stored will be of low use, but many of them may be of considerable monetary value and a high proportion will be irreplaceable with a very high historical or intellectual value. Humidity control, heating and air conditioning are essential for the preservation of the contents of

E. Mechanicals continued:

the storage facility.

The work and consultation areas will also require heating and air conditioning because the facility will be operated throughout the year with an on-site staff and controlled access by faculty and graduate students.

F. Lighting:

Adequate lighting in storage areas will be required to permit easy identification of books on lowest shelves of stack.

G. Security:

For the same reasons described under "E" above, security from fire and unauthorized access are elements to be given high priority in the design of the building.

/pa
12/29/76

PROCEDURES DOCUMENTS

GENERAL PROCEDURES

SELECTION

RETRIEVAL

PROCEDURES MANUAL-PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: THE ANNEX LIBRARY
 REVISED May 1973 Susan White, Annex Librarian

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction-----	1
II. The Annex Office in Firestone-----	2
A. Book Selection-----	2
B. Handling the Books and Cards-----	2
C. Methodology-----	3
1. Standard Procedures-----	3
a. Process Books in Call Number Order-----	3
(1) Size	
(2) Prepare Work Sheet or Mastersheet	
(3) When Mastersheet Is Complete	
(a) Loading the Green Trucks	
Special Note for Large Volumes	
What Are Green Trucks?	
(b) Loading Materials Into Boxes	
(4) Processing of Books By or In a	
Departmental Library	
b. Prepare Annex Cards (Standard Procedures)-----	7
(1) Two Copies of the Shelflist	
(2) In Review	
(3) Reinsert the Shelflist Cards	
(4) Alphabetize Annex Cards	
(5) Slipping or Notation	
2. Odd Books Procedures-----	10
3. Change of Bibliographic Record-----	11
a. Main Entry Slipping-----	11
b. Tracings-----	12
c. Departmental Library Catalogue-----	12
d. Serials Records-----	12
(1) The Added Entry -serials	
(2) When a Serial Is Not "Continued"	
(3) Procedure for a Split Serial	
4. Special Additional Note on Routing Slips in the	
University Shelflist-----	14
5. When There's More Than One With the Same Call	
Number-----	14
a. Volume and Copy Information-----	14
b. Multiple Copy Information-----	15
Verification Process	
c. Multiple Volume Sets-----	15
d. Multiple Title Series Cards-----	16
e. "Bound With" Notation-----	16
f. Analyzed Entries-----	16
D. Special Problems-----	16
1. In Circulation and Missing Volumes-----	17
2. Books With Cards Missing in a Catalogue-----	17
a. Shelflist Cards Missing-----	17
b. PC Main Entry Missing-----	17
c. Departmental Main Entry Missing-----	17
d. Added Entries (In Either PC or Departmental	
Libraries) Missing-----	17

3. Binding-----	18
4. Inventory-----	18
5. Mutilated Volumes-----	18
6. Titles in Greek or Russian Script-----	18
7. Withdrawal-----	19
8. White Slips for Call Numbers Already Held-----	19
III. The Annex Library on the Forrestal Campus-----	21
A. Operation-----	21
1. Circulation Procedure-----	21
a. When a Request Is Received-----	21
b. Check Sizes-----	21
c. If a Volume Is Not Readily Found-----	21
d. Processing the Book for Circulation-----	22
e. When Green Circulation Slip Is Received-----	22
f. When the Volume Is Returned-----	22
2. Reference Procedure-----	22
3. Annex Shelflist Card File-----	22
4. Annex Building Supervisor's Activities Schedule-----	22
B. Permanent Annex Collections-----	24
1. The Princeton Collection-----	24
2. Senior Theses-----	24
3. "T" Materials-----	24
4. Princeton University Press Mint Editions-----	24
5. 30109-----	25
6. (L)-----	25
7. Small Books and Little Magazines-----	25
8. Cook Chess Collection-----	25
C. De-Annexing Material-----	25
1. Remove the Book From the Shelf-----	26
2. Use Black Magic Marker-----	26
3. Pull Annex Shelflist Card-----	26
4. Return the Book-----	26
5. Send a Slip to the Annex Office-----	26
6. The Annex Office Keeps a Card-----	26
D. Volumes "New" to the Annex Sent There Directly Without Prior Processing-----	26
E. Withdrawal-----	27
Figures-----	29
Appendices-----	44

Figure 1.	Size Labels-----	29
Figure 2.	Sample Mastersheet-----	30
Figure 3.	Card Typing Format-----	33
Figure 4.	Sample Annex Office Card With Slipping Notations-----	34
Figure 5.	Serials Cards-----	35
Figure 6.	"Card Two" Form-----	36
Figure 7.	White Slip Form-----	37
Figure 8.	Sample Form To Be Attached to the White Card In the Circulation File-----	38
Figure 9.	Modern Greek Transliteration-----	39
Figure 10.	Sample "Annex Library Book Requests" Log Sheet-----	40
Figure 11.	Sample Mail Tag-----	41
Figure 12.	Annex Floor Plan-----	42

Appendix 1.	Special Explanation of the Terms "Main (or Author) Entry" and "Added Entry"-----	44
Appendix 2.	Special Supplies-----	45
Appendix 3.	Abbreviations Commonly Used-----	47
Appendix 4.	Special Brief Chart of Catalogue and Order Procedures-----	48
Appendix 5.	Samples-----	inside back cover

I. INTRODUCTION

The Annex Library of Princeton University is a classified compact storage place for lesser used material crowding the stacks of the Firestone Library and the twenty-odd "outside" libraries and departments of the University Library system which house special collections. The Annex Library is made up of two physically separate but closely interworking units. The first is the Annex Library proper, located on the Forrestal campus of Princeton University. It is operated by a Building Supervisor and is designed to provide ready access to any of the materials stored there through its open stack policy, delivery of books requested by telephone through twice daily inter-library mail, and the answering of reference questions by phone from specialized materials stored there. The second unit of the Annex Library is the Librarian's office located in Firestone Library on the main campus. This office serves as a bibliographic control center for the Annex, and as well provides an additional interface for both University Library personnel and the user for the Annex Library. The Librarian has one office assistant whose job it is to share the daily routine of the office and to maintain good public relations, as do all personnel working in the Annex system.

A special provision of the Annex Library is its lending of otherwise currently unoccupied shelf space to other departments in the library which have a temporary need for storage of materials. This is done under two provisions: the first, that the handling of such materials will not be overly time-consuming to the Annex staff; the second, that the shelving of such materials at no time take up space needed for the storage of regular Annex materials. Such a special use of the space there is possible through the future storage needs built into the Annex building. At the end of fiscal 1971-1972 it housed approximately 145,000 volumes on the existing shelves, and has a capacity of about 435,000 volumes here. Thirty thousand volumes are added during each fiscal year.

The Annex staff at all times stresses two concepts in its operations. The first is that any or all materials held there are available for use by, and, when properly requested, return to, the regular library system. The second is that the operation must always be flexible and amenable to the differing needs of departmental libraries and special collections.

II. THE ANNEX OFFICE IN FIRESTONE

The selection and preparation of materials designated for the Annex are handled through the Annex Library office; the card work is directed from this point, and any special processing of materials by or in a departmental library is directed from this office.

A. Book Selection

Book selection for the Annex Library is done by a variety of people. For some subjects selection is done by members of a department, often the chairperson of the department. As well, if a subject bibliographer in a particular field is available and has the time and inclination to select in his or her specialization, then he or she is an excellent selection choice. A third type of person is the knowledgeable librarian whose selected materials are put on review to the faculty before being sent to the Annex.

Books may be selected in advance of their actual removal from the shelves and their call numbers set down on a yellow legal pad, then called the "Work Sheet" or "Mastersheet," as is outlined in the "Standard Procedures" below. This is done either by an examination of the volumes at the shelf, or by going through the shelflist cards for a particular section.

A second alternative is that books may be taken from the shelf and sent to the Annex office or the Annex Library, at the discretion of the Annex librarian. Depending on the number of call numbers to be handled in a particular shelflist tray range, they will from this point be handled as either books for the "Standard Procedure" or "Odd Books Procedure."

B. Handling the Books and Cards

Purpose: The purposes of book and card handling in the Annex Library procedures are:

- .To assign the appropriate Annex shelving area (by longest dimension, usually height of spine), to each volume.
- .To see that volumes reach the Annex and are shelved in good order.
- .To keep a complete and accurate bibliographic work record on the Mastersheet or Odd Books slips.
- .To use that record to generate two copies of the University shelflist cards for each title.
- .To use...one of these copies as a shelflist card in the Annex Library
 - ...the other as a guide to all bibliographic reference for each title, to insure slipping or notation for each, and finally to use this card in the alphabetic catalogue in the Annex office.

Annex books are shelved by call number order within six height sizes which are determined by a specially marked measuring stick. The maximum height for each category is:

Size I.....	7 5/8 inches.....	19.4 cm.
II.....	9 1/4	23.5
III.....	10 3/4	27.3
IV.....	13 5/8	34.6
V.....	16 5/8	42.3

Elephant.....above size V; no maximum height has been established for this Annex size.

C. METHODOLOGY

The handling of books being processed for storage is one of two types, Standard or Odd Books, defined in terms of how many titles will fall within any one shelflist tray. These are working definitions. The Odd Books procedure involves copying shelflist cards by hand at the shelflist, and then typing that copy to produce the two card Annex record. The Standard Procedure involves removing appropriate shelflist trays to the Annex office, pulling needed cards, and having two copies made of each one on the Library's 3-2-1 Xerox machine to create the two card Annex record. While no exact number of call numbers can be given for the dividing point between standard and odd book groups, good judgment on the part of the Annex staff is rather used and produces a reasonable process; a "few" are handled as Odd Books, a "lot" as Standard.

1. Standard Procedures

THE REMAINDER OF THIS 27-PAGE DOCUMENT IS AVAILABLE
UPON REQUEST FROM SPEC.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

TO: Mrs. Sally Rowley
FROM: Mrs. Pamela Vance
DATE: June 26, 1975
SUBJECT: Storage Systems Procedure

STORAGE SYSTEM

I. Criteria

- A. The Classifications to be reviewed are B, D, E, F, and H.
- B. Books acquired 1950 and earlier and with no circulation from 1950 to date are candidates for storage. (This means the book had a chance for 25 years to circulate, but has not gone out.)
- C. No stack reference books are to be reviewed.
- D. The collection from the Philosophy Department (APE code) will not be reviewed.
- E. Quartos and folios will not be reviewed.
- F. If the acquisition date is in question, the book will not be stored.

II. Preparation for Storage

A. Book Stacks Area Procedures.

- 1. Labels will be stamped with an accession number.
- 2. Books will be pulled by pages according to the criteria.
 - a. Two trucks a day will be pulled.
 - b. The books will be divided so that books which have already been keypunched will be separate from those which have not been keypunched.
 - c. Book trucks will be dated and kept behind the third floor page station.
- 3. Bibliographers and Information Librarians will review books.
 - a. Bill will place a note on bibliographers' door and Information Librarians' bulletin board indicating when new trucks are ready.
 - b. Books will be held 3 days for review.
 - c. Librarians reviewing the books should initial the slip attached to the book truck.
 - d. All books remaining will be sent to storage.

4. Labels, in accession number order, will be placed on spine of book.
5. Books which have not been edited will be brief edited for storage by Pat Bartley and Mary Metz.
6. Bill will keep a record of the last accession number used and the last book actually in storage.
7. Books will be sent to Key punch.

B. Key punch

1. New storage card will be punched with following information:
 - a. Complete call number.
 - b. Control number.
 - c. Storage number.
2. Storage cards will be kept on file by L.S.D.
3. L.S.D. will produce 4 storage print-outs for: Lending (2), Book Stacks and Technical Processes.
4. Books will be sent to Mail Room.

III. Transporting to Storage Area

- A. Books will be packed in boxes in Mail Room.
- B. Books will be sent to the Anthropology Building every other Friday by truck.

IV. Storage Area

- A. Books will be unpacked by pages every other Monday.
- B. Book arrangement will be by storage number.
- C. Bill Forsythe will keep a record of the number of the last book shelved in storage.

V. Retrieval

- A. Copy of storage print-out will be available to the public.
- B. Patron will fill out retrieval request form and submit it to the Lending Desk.
- C. All patrons will be able to request books from storage.
- D. Request form will go to Frank Hill's office for retrieval.

- E. 48 hour delivery will be promised except over week-ends.
If a request is received Friday, promise Tuesday delivery.
- F. Books will be delivered to designated shelf in Lending.
- G. Books without a standard circulation card will be rushed for editing and keypunching.
- H. The Lending staff will stamp the IBM card STORAGE so that when the book is discharged it will be caught for storage.
- I. The book will then be interfiled by patron name, on the Personal Reserve Shelf.

/pab

cc: Bibliographers/Information Librarians

Miss McKenna
Mr. Slater
Mr. Hill
Mr. Luffy
Mr. Forsythe
Mrs. Kretchun
Miss Pat Bartley
Mrs. Mary Metz

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63130

April 14, 1977

To: Judy Fox, Shirley Jones, Laura Kuelthau, John Strecker, David Burbank
Betty Weiss, and Betty Galyon

From: David Zubatsky, Assistant University Librarian *DZ*

Re: Revised Tyson Valley Storage Procedures

I. Location symbol and shelving arrangement of serials at Tyson Valley

- A. Serials will be arranged by a consecutive numbering system, e.g., 1, 2, 3, 4, etc., on the shelves. The Serials Department will be responsible for the assigning of numbers to serial titles.
- B. Labels indicating the serial title number will be affixed only to the first and last volumes of each title. The Serials Department will be responsible for affixing these labels.

II. Record Control

- A. The Serials Department will note on their records the serials title number along with the Tyson designation after its staff has taken a physical inventory of the set within Olin's or Departmental Libraries' stacks.

III. Shelving and Retrieval Responsibilities

- A. Requesting volumes to be retrieved.

Form 239, "Tyson Center Retrieval Request", is used to request volumes to be retrieved. It is filled out in the Serials Dept. or Departmental Library by the requester and/or a staff member. In Olin, Circulation will be responsible for forwarding forms to Mail Service, while Departmentals will forward them directly. The form is prepared for each volume, since it will be inserted in each corresponding volume to identify it as a storage item. (The Library van is scheduled to leave Olin Library for Tyson at 1:00 p.m. on Thursdays.) Photocopies of the form may be used for multivolumes of the same requested title.

B. Handling of items after return to Library.

Each Olin requested item is taken to the Circulation Dept. by Mail Service immediately after the Tyson run is completed. Departmental requests will be delivered on the Mail Service's next regularly scheduled delivery. Each volume contains a corresponding Form 239.

C. Return of volumes to storage.

Volumes to be returned are clearly labeled by the Circulation Dept. or Departmental Library. Each also contains the Form 239 previously mentioned to show Tyson destination. They are returned on the regular Thursday van trip. Each item is placed back on the shelf in its correct location. If a substantial number of items are to be retrieved and/or returned on any trip, a stack attendant accompanies the Mail Service driver. (Ordinarily only the driver need make the Tyson trip.)

After each item is returned to Tyson, the Mail Service Supervisor writes in the return date on Form 239 (last line) and his initials. The forms are filed in the Mail Service.

D. Stack maintenance.

The Stack Supervisor visits Bunker #29 periodically according to amount of retrieval traffic to insure that the stored volumes are being kept in good order.

IV. Loan Procedures

- A. Tyson Valley serials will be loaned according to the established Olin Library or Departmental Library borrowing procedures.
- B. All Olin loaned volumes will appear on the daily circulation print out.

STORAGE OF LIBRARY MATERIALS

AT TYSON VALLEY

SERIALS

Introduction

The space situation in Olin Library has reached the point where unlimited retention of all materials can no longer be justified because of cost and use factors. Therefore, it has become necessary to establish priorities for the selective retirement of materials from the stacks -- either by storage or by withdrawal. Since the Collection Policy Committee has already produced a statement on weeding (q.v.), which provides acceptable interim guidelines for withdrawals, the present document will concern itself exclusively with storage.

Coverage:

This statement will deal only with the storage of serials. Separate procedures for the storage of monographs will have to be formulated later.

Application:

These policies are designed to provide flexible guidelines and need not be implemented rigidly. It is conceivable that a title might fit all of the requirements listed in section IA and still not be suitable for transfer to Tyson, e.g., if it had permanent reference value. Therefore, the procedures will be enforced discriminately and can be halted at any stage of implementation, if in the opinion of the Principal Bibliographer there is adequate cause for doing so.

I. SELECTION

A. Criteria

The following categories of serial publications are eligible for transfer to Tyson:

1. "Dead" or non-current titles
2. Titles superseded by microtext (e.g., American Periodical Series)
3. Little-used materials (e.g., foreign language publications)
4. Volumes whose physical condition can withstand transport
5. Titles readily available in other St. Louis area libraries or from the Center for Research Libraries
6. Back files, i.e., pre-1950 issues, of current serials (e.g., Economist)

B. Procedures

1. Titles may be recommended for transfer to Tyson on form no. by:
 - a. Bibliographers
 - b. Departmental Librarians
 - c. Acquisitions/Serials Department Chief
 - d. Circulation Department Chief
2. All recommendations must be approved by the Principal Bibliographer, who will consult with others as necessary.

II. IMPLEMENTATION

- A. The Building-Security Assistant will supervise the transport of materials to and from Tyson
- B. Other responsibilities will be delegated among the various departments in Olin in accordance with their regular duties
- C. Withdrawal instead of transfer may be recommended at any stage of the process
- D. Titles from departmental libraries will normally be transferred directly to Tyson rather than to Olin.

III. RECORDS

(To be worked out by the Technical Services Group)

MILLS MEMORIAL LIBRARYSTORAGE PROJECT: STACKS BOOKSObject

To move some of the least used material to the locked compact storage area in the sub-basement.

The 3rd floor, (literature) being the most crowded, was given priority. O-1X was also considered because of bad crowding in that area.

Criteria

Consideration for storage was given to :

1. Books which had been on the shelf for 5 years and had not circulated.
2. Books of which there were 2 or more editions or copies.
1. Books which had been on the shelf for 5 years and had not circulated.

These were examined by the circulation librarian with occasional advice from other librarians and the following categories were rejected for storage and remained on the shelves.

- a. books with reference value e.g. dictionaries, concordances.
- b. books with considerable browsing interest in sections which were being well used e.g. books on Elizabethan theatres in the Shakespeare section.
- c. important works of scholarship which should be on the shelves academic libraries.
- d. books which were parts of sets of which other parts were circulating i.e. the whole set must either go to storage or stay.

To offset the "hit and miss" aspect of these value judgements the library representatives are being asked their opinion of the material being put down to storage. Requests to reshelve in the stacks can be easily met.

2. Books of which there were two or more editions or copies.

These were examined by the circulation librarian to see how much the title was circulating and how many editions and/or copies should stay to meet the demand and how many could go down to storage.

Method

1. The stacks staff turned down all books which had been in the library for 5 years and had not circulated.
To do this they used
- a. date received on book pocket or book label.

cont

- b. if no date, they used accession number as guide.
 - c. the date due slips for circulation.
2. These were lookd at by the circulation librarian, with occasional help, in the light of the above criteria, and some were put upright and stayed in the stacks.
In addition the circulation librarian looked for duplicate editions and copies.
 3. Books selected for storage were put on a truck and shelved in the sub-basement.
 4. The book pockets of these books were stamped "storage" and the punched cards extracted and filed in call number order.
 5. A listing in call number order was run from the cards in call number order. Three copies were produced. One copy of the print out was put out for reader consultation: one was kept at the Circulation Desk and one was sent to the various faculty members.
 6. Faculty were consulted as to the selection. Several volumes were returned to the stacks on their advice, (e.g. about 60 in Classics, about 30 in English, 200 in Italian and 300 in Spanish, because of planned expansion).
 7. The cards were then run on to a "storage tape" and then returned to the books. This tape has been used to produce a more permanent and better presented list of books in storage which has been bound and put out for reader consultation. For sections currently being examined, the temporary print out list is used.
 8. When books are required by readers, they are fetched by the circulation staff.

STORAGE

1. DEWEY STORAGE

Prior to the storage programme described here, about 20,000 books from the Dewey section of the library (sections which have not yet been reclassified by L.C.) were put to compact storage on roughly the same criteria but without faculty consultation. The majority of them are very old books not used for a considerable number of years.

2. L.C. STORAGE

BX 968 vols. (This was a particularly crowded area).

W-ED 3,968 vols. (With a recent move this area has become less crowded, .. dropped in priority).

	<u>Total No. of Volumes</u>	<u>Put to Storage</u>	<u>%</u>
P-PA	8,500	800	9.4%
PB-PF	4,500	411	9.1%
PG	3,800	568	14.9%
PH-PI	4,500	1,052	23.1%
PX	6,300	1,030	16.3%
PO	10,700	500	
PR	29,000	3,243	11.1%

(not including Goldsmith shelved temporarily in storage area).

PS	5,000	355	7.1%
(not including Canadian literature-section not considered for storage).			
PT	6,200	507	8.1%
O-TX	8,500	955	11.1%

Currently working on the D section, which has become the most crowded.

Margaret Mages
Co-ordinator of Circulation
1975

PROCEDURES FOR STORAGE

PUTTING BOOKS TO COMPACT STORAGE : TURNING DOWN BOOKS

The normal criteria for consideration for storage is :

1. The book should have been in the library for at least 5 years.
2. It should not have gone out at all in that period.

In order to determine these 2 factors

1. Take each book from the shelf and look at the date received or the accession number to see how long it has been in the library. Date received is on the back pocket of some of the older books or on the front cover of the really old ones. For newer books you have to rely on the accession number to determine date received. List attached.
2. If the first criteria is satisfied - that is the book has been in the library for 5 years, then look at the date due slip to see if it has gone out in the last 5 years.
The "RRL" stamp started about 1972. The small red and green stamps with "MCM" are about 1970-72. The old black ones are even earlier. Please discount new black stamps. These designate an interlibrary loan which is not counted as a Mills circulation.
3. If the book satisfies these criteria pull it down so that it is sticking out, and a librarian will select for storage.

PUTTING BOOKS TO COMPACT STORAGE: GUIDE FOR SELECTING MATERIALS

- 1/ Those turned down have not, as far as we can tell, been out for five years. Check for any books wrongly turned down. Watch for books which have been well used but have a new date due slip in them.
- 2/ Monographs. Watch for "reference" type material, and material in a section which is well used which would make good browsing. Turn these back upright if you think they should stay.
- 3/ Sets. All volumes of sets must either stay in stacks, or all volumes go down to storage.
- 4/ Multiple copies: monographs. When there are several copies of a single book, perhaps some can go down to storage. For monographs, put the earlier copies to storage and leave the later in the stacks. e.g. cop. 1 - storage: cop. 2 - stacks or cop 1-3 storage: cop 4-6 stacks. This means books which have been out in the past few years may go down to storage.

Please note all these copy situations on sheet for that section in call number order to help us mark the catalogue.

5/ Multiple Copies: Sets

If there are several copies of sets, some can probably go down, even if some volumes of a particular copy have gone out. With sets, keep copy one in stacks and send down later copies. This is because later copies of sets are sometimes incomplete. Please mark sheet for these cases, e.g.

cop. 1 stacks: cop 2 and 3 in storage: cop 3 incomplete.

6/ Different Editions

Usually keep the later edition in stacks and put earlier one down. Same with editions of sets. Again please mark sheets.

- 7/ Doubtful Cases. Consult the inventory print out as if necessary circulation report for difficult cases e.g. incomplete sets, missing copies etc. to see what we are supposed to have. Again please mark sheet.

CIRCULATION ANALYSIS
AND
STORAGE DECISION RECORD

A. CIRCULATION ANALYSIS BY: LOAN DEPT. _____; OTHER _____

1. TYPE OF MATERIAL

____ MONOGRAPH (CIRCULATING)
____ MONOGRAPH (LIBRARY USE)____ PERIODICAL, SERIAL (CIRCULATING)
____ PERIODICAL, SERIAL (LIBRARY USE)

2. PHYSICAL VOLUMES AND SHELF SPACE

NUMBER OF VOLUMES _____

SHELF SPACE OCCUPIED _____

3. CIRCULATION RECORD AND STATISTICS

DATE(S) OF MOST RECENT CHARGE(S) _____

NUMBER OF CHARGES (OR VOLUMES OFF SHELF)

0 _____; 1-2 _____; 3-4 _____; 5-6 _____; 7-10 _____; 10 OR MORE _____

OTHER EVIDENCE OF E.G., VOLUMES WORN, ETC.: _____

4. PATTERN OF USE OF BACKFILES

MOST RECENT 5-10 YEARS:

USED _____ NOT USED _____

MOST RECENT 11-15 YEARS:

USED _____ NOT USED _____

MOST RECENT 16-25 YEARS:

USED _____ NOT USED _____

ENTIRE FILE CIRCULATES _____

COMMENTS: _____

5. CONDITION OF MATERIAL

BINDING DECISION REQUIRED, E.G., VOLUMES(S) IN TITLE ARE INCOMPLETE, WORN, LOOSE ISSUES
IN STACKS, ETC. _____

VOLUMES MISSING IN INVENTORY _____

6. REVIEWER _____

B. COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT OR BRANCH LIBRARY DECISIONS

1. STORAGE RECOMMENDATION

____ NO CHANGE

____ CURRENT

(YEARS, VOLUMES) RETAINED IN PRESENT LOCATION; REMAINDER SHOULD

____ BE PUT IN STORAGE

____ ENTIRE TITLE TO STORAGE

____ KEEP

____ COPY(IES) IN PRESENT LOCATION; REMAINING COPIES SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

2. STORAGE OPTIONS

____ LOCAL

____ OFF CAMPUS

3. OTHER OPTIONS

____ WITHDRAWN ENTIRE TITLE; CONSIDER CANCELLING CURRENT SUBSCRIPTION IF TITLE IS ACTIVE

____ WITHDRAW _____ (VOLUMES, YEARS, COPIES) MAINTAIN CURRENT SUBSCRIPTION IF TITLE IS ACTIVE

____ CONSIDER WITHDRAWING _____ (VOLUMES, YEARS, COPIES) IF TITLE CAN BE OBTAINED IN MICROFORMAT

OTHER: _____

4. RECOMMENDATION BY: _____

5. LIBRARY REPRESENTATIVES CONSULTED: ____ YES ____ NO

6. DEPARTMENTS AND REPRESENTATIVES CONSULTED: _____

COMMENTS: _____

Instructions for Selecting
Candidates for Transfer to Annex Library

Please select large sets as candidates for the initial transfer of materials to the Annex Library. Clear recommendations should be made for transfer of partial sets.

Large sets are defined as: little-used serials, periodicals, multi-volume sets, newspapers, microforms, etc., which are one shelf (3 linear feet) or more in size. Transfer of large sets is scheduled to occur between January and June, 1978.

Materials which appear to be candidates for transfer should be recorded individually, by author and/or title, on the form "Candidates for Transfer to Annex Library". Instructions for completing the form are as follows:

1. Call Number -- Library of Congress or other classification. Write call number horizontally. If unclassified, give exact shelf location.
2. Holdings -- List total holdings in volumes and years (for example, v. 1-15, 1940-1955). Note partial sets here including the portion of set retained.
3. Linear Feet -- Push volumes together, measure, and round off to nearest foot.
4. Volumes -- Indicate number of volumes in each set to be transferred.
5. Location -- Give holding library. Specify exact location if volumes are not in normal call number location.
6. Condition & Binding -- Check appropriate description. If material is partially bound, indicate number of volumes bound and unbound.
7. Microfilm Available -- Indicate availability if readily ascertainable.

Completed forms should be returned to Arthur Kulp (201 Olin Library) from whom additional forms can be obtained. The Assistant Director for Development of Collections will review Annex Library candidates for duplication, missing volumes and volumes in poor condition.

RMR:lh
3/1/77

Summer, 1972
 Social Science Division
 N.B. These Guidelines
 supercede all others.
 Please discard others.

GUIDELINES: WEEDING FOR WITHDRAWAL AND COMPACT STORAGE

Prior to this time the Social Science Division has not had a continuing weeding project. From time to time in past years as the stacks overflowed and there was no additional space forthcoming, the Division embarked on special weeding projects. These projects more or less accomplished the immediate objective of additional space. But, they created confusion and breakdowns in record keeping. These Guidelines should be viewed as an attempt to minimize disorder in a continuing weeding process.

Examples of this somewhat slapdash method of weeding the stacks are the creation of the Education Library (which, if this library is ever enlarged sufficiently, will probably be re-absorbed here), the Hum-comp project and the removal of the 650's to the hall-way of the Science Library. The 340's location was another maneuver to make room in the "regular" book stacks.

The unique numbering system used for our compact storage materials was devised locally to allow maximum utilization of space available. The letters refer to size of books and nature of material (e.g. AA = undersize, A = normal size, B = serials, F = oversize mono and serial).

The long range goals of the continual weeding program are:

1. Tight compacting of all Dewey materials in the Social Science Division with
2. The eventual recataloging into LC of all live series. (N.B. There is no intention of ever recataloging all library holdings into LC).
3. Retirement to the basement compact storage area of little used material.
4. Withdrawal of multiple copies which have outlived their usefulness.
5. Withdrawal of other material as given in the following definitions and checklist.

In order to accomplish the aims above the process must be a continuing one. Hence, all procedures ought to be orderly and routines involving other areas of the library need to be clarified.

DEFINITIONS (ECN's 3 June 72 memo)

- I. Duplicate: More than one exact copy of an item in the collection.
- II. Duplicate and Exchange: Materials offered for sale or exchange, whether or not they duplicate items in our collection (of IIIB. Unrelated to IIIA).
- III. Exchange
 - A. The agreement called "Gifts and Exchange" is one whereby publications at institutions are exchanged. These publications are usually serials. The agreement may limit the exchanges by subject matter or by number of titles. Acquisitions makes such exchange agreements at the request.

BEST COPY

of a divisional library, or acting with divisional approval upon the suggestion of another institution. WSU Library has only one item to offer on exchange, so "Gifts and Exchanges" is not a large or important factor in increasing our present acquisitions.

- B. "Exchange" is also a shortened term for the United States Book Exchange program. We send to the central office list of material we wish to dispose of. Lists from all participating libraries are compiled and distributed. Any library may request any item appearing on these lists. Prices of such materials are much reduced from normal new or used book market prices (of II). Sale of property of the State of Washington is greatly restricted by law and such sale is a cumbersome process (of IV). Items to be offered for sale by Washington State institutions must normally first be offered free of charge to other State agencies and institutions, and only then is a sale by bid arranged.

NOTE: It is to B above that the term "dup and exchange" refers. Do not confuse with the Gifts and Exchanges program.

- IV Sale: Items sold directly to other institutions or agencies (see end of B, above) are required to be sold after considerable formality by officials of the State of Washington after a formal call for bids. If the material is sold, the University may apply to the State for all or part of the money derived from the sale, and the Library may in turn apply for all or part of the money from the University. Without such applications, the funds become a part of the general funds of the State, or of the general funds of the University. The entire procedure is complicated and strictly controlled by law. If interested, inquire further rather than experimenting, which is one of the quicker routes to Walla Walla. (Continued)

Few of us have occasion to know much of used books values, and the sale of State property is sufficiently cumbersome that "gifts to the less fortunate" is the better route to follow in disposing of books unless considerable values are involved. On the whole, it seems to me better that we in Social Science simply use the "withdrawn" indication. All such materials put on our "Dup and Exch" shelves and "Withdrawn" shelves go to the "Dup & Exchange" cage in the basement, no matter how marked.

With somewhat greater knowledge of needs of other institutions and of the saleability of material, the chief of TSD, John Allen, goes over all material in the cage for items which may be potentially usable by other institutions, and for saleable items. If you have any information about the value of an item withdrawn, and think it might be saleable, talk to the division chief of TSD about it.

PROCEDURES FOR WEEDING

- I. Serials: The appropriate subject specialist, and the head of serial records or his delegate, must pass on all items withdrawn from the collection. See also III and V
- II. Monographs: The appropriate subject specialist and the head of Circulation or delegate must participate in all decisions to withdraw.
- III. All Reference items require the opinion of the head of Reference, as well as of the other participants listed in I and II.

- IV. All Documents require the opinion of the head of documents as well as other participants indicated above.
- V. All items involving binding require the opinion of the person in charge of binding as well as other participants listed above.
- VI. No WSU-produced item may be withdrawn without approval from Archives (T. Abraham for WSU Material in 1972).
- VII. At least two appropriate opinions must be secured, in case duplicates are received, in the decision whether or not to add the more recent copy.
- VIII. Discard: (into the waste basket) superseded and promotional material, after correcting records if needed. Superseded items seldom useful to anyone anywhere!

NOTE: If at any time one individual is in two of the positions mentioned above, an alternate opinion should be secured from a second person.

All weeding, both material to be sent to compact storage and material to be withdrawn are subject to review by the Division chief. All librarians will weed in their assigned subject areas. The assigned areas to be weeded correspond to the subject areas to which librarians are assigned for collection responsibilities. A list of these assigned subject areas is appended.

Since all librarians will be weeding as their schedules permit and no fixed schedule for material to be processed can apply, the actual items can not be pulled from the shelves. Instead, a P-slip will be made. The P-slips should be green for serials and white for monographs. The P-slip should contain all information necessary for decisions and recommendations. If the item being considered for weeding is a serial, the completed serial review form should be attached. If the recommendation is that the material should be sent to compact storage, the compact storage slip should be attached to the P-slip. The compact storage slip must be in triplicate for serial record items and in duplicate for monographs.

Since it is the Divisional policy that nothing is to be weeded without consultation, see above and definitions to ensure that the appropriate people have been consulted and all pertinent information has been given.

The completed P-slips, with the recommended action, should be given to A. Taylor, who as part of his responsibilities as supervisor of book selection and weeding will secure the division chief's approval and monitor the work flow. AT will keep the P-slips in a file on his desk in call number order. Librarians who want to be aware of weeding in other than their assigned areas of responsibility are encouraged to read the file and attach their comments. As cataloging, marking and the collection custodians inform AT of their readiness to accept more material, the material and the P-slips with attachments will be routed to them. Hence, action upon your recommendations will rarely be immediate. However, this must in no way preclude steady progress in your area. While the process should follow call number order, from time to time you may be asked to weed in a specific area.

Marking of records, books, and recording of withdrawals: To be done only by AT or under his supervision.

To withdraw an item: Stamp "withdraw Washington State University Library" on the book card, the bookcard pocket and on the bookplate. Place the card in "Vernon Parks box" to go to cataloging. Place the book on the withdrawal shelves with note indicating who withdrew, who gave 2nd opinion, when, etc. The cataloging assistant will pick up the book card and from it the records will be corrected in cataloging. The book itself will be stored in the basement cage for a time and eventually destroyed or given to the "less fortunate."

The "DUP & Exchange" stamp is used in place of the "withdrawn" stamp except on the book card, which is stamped "withdrawn." Books are placed on the dup and exchange shelves with appropriate notes, and again are stored in the basement until accepted by another institution, or sale is arranged, or it is determined that they must be destroyed.

WEEDING CHECKLIST

1. Have the appropriate people been consulted?
2. Does Serial Record need to be consulted?
3. Does Reference need to be consulted?
4. Does Circulation need to be consulted?
5. Does Binding need to be consulted? Watch for material that needs binding even though it will not be weeded. Call this material to the binding supervisor's attention.
6. Is any recataloging or cataloging indicated? Some material in Dewey is classed but not cataloged. You can ascertain this only by checking the main a/t.
7. Class seps and anals need to be routed through the serial record. Hence, you must determine whether an item is a class sep or anal by checking the series in the serial record or the SR tracing on the catalog card.
8. Is any of the material already in compact storage? Compact storage numbers are recorded in the serial record for series, periodicals and journals, except for class sep series and analyzed series. Compact storage numbers for monographs, class sep series and analyzed series are recorded in the shelf list.

Historical note: Compact storage numbers for class sep or analyzed series may be recorded in either the shelf list or serial record or both. So, you will need to check both places. Prior to 1968 there were no shelf list cards made for the individual titles within an analyzed series - only a series main was made. You will find the compact storage number on the series main.

9. If recat, that is, a live series - is there room in the new stack location? You can ascertain the LC class number by checking the LC or NUC printed catalogs.

10. If compact storage, is it a live series which needs recataloging before compacting?
11. Is the circulation history indicated?
12. Is the item useful for a future area library or future undergraduate library?
If so, do not withdraw, only compact.

PROCEDURES FOR
RETRIEVAL OF MATERIALS FROM STORAGE

I. OBJECTIVE

To establish an orderly and effective means of retrieving and obtaining an item from storage.

II. POLICY

Regardless of the original location of the materials being retrieved from storage (Hillman or Departmental Libraries), all items will be retrieved and circulated through the Hillman Lending Operation. Consequently, these circulating materials must be returned to Hillman in order to insure their proper return to storage. A 24-hour delivery will be promised, except over weekends. If a request is received on Friday, promise Monday delivery.

III. FORMS USED

PITT 2103 (11/75) Storage Request Card (Sample I)
PITT 1205 (11/67) Red Circulation Book Card (Sample II)

IV. PROCEDURES

A. Request for retrieving an item(s) from storage:

1. Use of Form

Anyone wishing to retrieve an item from storage, must complete a "Storage Request Card" (PITT 2103) at the Ground Floor Lending Desk in Hillman Library (See Sample I). (Departmental Libraries will refer their patrons wishing to retrieve an item from storage to the Hillman Ground Floor Lending Desk.) The information that one needs to complete this form can only be obtained by referencing the "Books in Storage" printout which will be located at the Ground Floor Lending Desk.

2. Completion of Forms

The following information must be provided on the Storage Request Card in order to insure both accurate and timely retrieval:

- a. Storage number (from storage printout)
- b. Call number
- c. Borrower's I.D. number
- d. Today's date
- e. Complete name and address information

3. Routing of Form

Upon completion of the Storage Request Card, a member of the Lending Services Staff will deliver the forms to the Supply Room (G-55 Hillman) as soon as possible.

B. Retrieval of Material from Storage

Once the Storage Request Card is delivered to the Supply Room (G-55 Hillman), it is the responsibility of the Supply Services office to retrieve the item(s) in question. If the item already contains a "Red" IBM Book Card with a "Storage" stamp across the card itself, (see Sample II), deliver the item directly to Lending Services for circulation. If the item does not contain the above specified book card and storage stamp, forward these items to Data Processing with the storage request card placed inside the front cover.

C. Processing By Keypunch

There are two types of materials that may be retrieved from storage:

1. Items which do not contain an IBM Book Card.
2. Items which contain an IBM Book Card.

a. Processing of items not containing an IBM Book Card:

1. If an item does not have an IBM Book Card enclosed, the material first must be edited by the Keypunch Supervisor. In the case of foreign language or other questionable materials, these items should be hand-carried to a librarian for clarification of the problem.
2. Once the material has been edited, the item should be forwarded to the End Processing section so that the necessary book pocket may be inserted.
3. When the item is returned to Data Processing, a "Red" Book Card must now be produced. This production will follow "normal processing" procedures except for the following:
 - a. The control number assigned to these items will be from the series of old book numbers. They will not be of the same nature as those used for new book processing.
EX: Use an "00" number as opposed to a "76" or "77" number.
 - b. The location code to be used in all of these storage items is "STO". This location code has been specially assigned for statistical purposes. The control number produced above must also be punched into the appropriate card of the "Books in Storage" card file.
4. Upon completion of the "Red" IBM Book Card, the card itself will be stamped in "red" with the storage stamp. (See Sample II). This stamp will be Lending Services' way of detecting a book circulated from storage when the item is returned.
5. Deliver item to Lending Services where it will be placed in a designated area for pick-up by patron.

b. Processing of items containing an IBM Book Card:

1. For processing of items which already contain an IBM Book Card, steps 3, 4, and 5 will be followed above, except that instead of using an old book card number, use the same control number as that appearing on the book card presently in the book. There is also no need to punch the appropriate control number in the books in storage card file, because this number was punched when the item was sent to storage. (See Step 3c.)

V. CIRCULATION OF MATERIALS

- A. Circulation of storage materials will follow normal lending policy which is dependent on borrower status.
- B. When discharging, if an item has a red book card with the word "STORAGE" stamped across the book card, these materials should be placed on a separate shelf designated as "Items to be returned to Storage". The Stack Supervisor should be notified that there are materials to be returned to storage. It is the responsibility of the Stack Supervisor to insure proper return and refiling of storage items to their proper location in the storage area.

11/24/76
RGS/kl